

THE ROMANIC REVIEW

VOL. I—OCTOBER—DECEMBER, 1910—No. 4

PETRARCH'S CONFESSIONS

(Continued from page 246)

IMPORTANT as are the first two dialogues for the light they shed upon the poet's inner life, his motives and doubts, the interest of the Confessions perhaps culminates in the conversation of the third and last day, during which Petrarch's love for Laura and his longing for fame are considered.

Of the woman who is the theme of nearly all of Petrarch's Italian lyrics we know almost nothing. There is a memorable record of her death on the fly-leaf of her lover's favorite copy of Virgil, and two or three more or less vague references to his passion for her in his voluminous prose correspondence. In a Latin metrical epistle he has something to say of the matter to his friend Giacomo Colonna. The Confessions, however, afford us the clearest picture of the lover turned philosopher, and no one can read them without understanding the Italian sonnets better and grasping more clearly a fundamental contrast between the mediaeval and modern theory of life.

One of the most serious of Petrarch's earlier moral conflicts was that waged in his bosom between the monk and the self-respecting lover. He was forced, if he would find rest, to reconcile, or decide between, the mediaeval ecclesiastical and the modern secular conception of man's love for woman. By the ecclesiastical or monkish view of love is meant, of course, the belief in its essential depravity and inherent sinfulness, quite regardless of the particular relations between the lover and his beloved. Petrarch, although quite averse to theology, held some of the great church fathers, especially Augustine, in high esteem, and their doctrines of the close association of sexual love and original sin were familiar to him. He was, more-

over, a priest himself and a devout adherent of the traditional faith of his church. His brother had entered a monastery and he himself wrote a little work in praise of the conventional life. On the other hand he knew his classics well, and loved and revered the authors of antiquity to whom love was no sin. He revolted by nature against the theory that the deep and permanent fascination which woman exercises over man is diabolical in its origin, as was taught by the mediaeval preachers and illustrated by many a coarse and licentious tale; and in the dialogue to which we now turn he defends with refreshing earnestness the higher and purer conception of his affection. His respect for Augustine, who consistently asserts the debasing nature of the passion, is, however, too profound to permit him in the end to reject altogether the monkish notions.

To return to the dialogue. Augustine would finally strike off two golden manacles, love and fame, whose specious glitter so dazzles the poor captive that he reckons them his most precious possessions. None of his aspirations have ever seemed to him more noble than the very ones Augustine now reproaches him for. "What have I done to you," Francesco indignantly asks, "that you should seek to deprive me of my most glorious preoccupations and condemn to perpetual night the brightest portions of my soul?" It seems to him that his Confessor is indiscriminately condemning two quite different things when he declares love to be the maddest of all forms of madness. If love is sometimes the lowest form of passion it may also be the noblest activity of the soul. He can imagine nothing happier than the attraction which a truly noble woman has exercised over him. He has never loved aught but the beautiful, and if he is mistaken in his conception of love he prefers to remain so. To Augustine's ready objection that one may love even the beautiful shamefully, he replies, with ill-timed levity, that he has sinned neither in noun nor adverb and that Augustine must prove him to be ill before he tries his remedies, since physic has often undone a well man.

Augustine expresses his frank astonishment that a person of such parts should have allowed himself to be deceived by false blandishments during no less than sixteen years past. His lady's eyes will, however, one day be closed by death, then the lover will

recall with shame his infatuation for the poor perishable body. Sickness and successive trials have already told upon her, and her lovely person has lost much of its pristine vigor. He does not question her virtues. He will grant that she is a queen, a saint, a goddess, Phoebus's own sister, if her lover will have it so. Her supreme qualities however furnish no excuse for Francesco's errors. Obviously the most virtuous may be the object of an unworthy passion.

"One thing at least I will say," Francesco exclaims, "whatever I have achieved is due to her. I should never have been what I am, if there be any distinction or glory in that, had not the scattered seeds of virtue which nature implanted in this breast been cultivated by her through my noble attachment. She restrained my youthful spirit from every shameful act . . . she led me to look toward higher things." "Is it wonderful," he continues, "that her noble fame has provoked in me a longing for a like reputation and has lightened the strenuous effort with which I pursued my object? How could I have done better in my youthful days than to please her who alone pleased me? For I cast aside a thousand seductions of pleasure in order to take up the serious tasks of life before my time. You know this well and yet you command me to forget, or love in only a half-hearted fashion, her who separated me from the vulgar company and guided me in all my chosen paths, stimulating my sluggish nature and rousing my dull intellect."⁴

To all this Augustine has two objections. In the first place, although Francesco's love may have saved him from minor errors, his anxiety for fame which he attributes to it has put him on the shortest road to spiritual death. In the second place, it is vain for him to maintain that he loves chiefly the soul, that he would have loved her spirit in even "a foul and knotty body (*in squalido et nodoso corpore*)," for he has but to interrogate the past to see that he has steadily degenerated since first he met his lady. She, indeed, has done all she could to keep him right. In spite of his prayers and allurements she maintained her womanly integrity, and although their ages and circumstances would have shaken the stoutest resolutions, she remained firm and unapproachable. In his effort to absolve and exalt her Petrarch of course condemns himself and so justifies Augustine's contention. Love in spite of our illusions

⁴The same idea is expressed in the *canzone* beginning, *Perchè la vita.*

about it is but a passion for temporal things, and nothing so surely separates man from God. Let Francesco consider its pestiferous effects in his own case; how, suddenly, his life was dissolved in tears and sighs, how he spent sleepless nights with the name of the beloved ever on his lips; how he despised his usual pursuits, hated life, fled his fellow beings and longed for sad death. Wasted and pale and restless, his eyes ever moist, his mind confused, his voice weak and hoarse,—no more miserable and distracted creature could be imagined.

"Not contented with her living face," Augustine continues, "you must forsooth seek out a famous painter⁵ in order that you might carry about her image, fearful lest your tears might otherwise cease. And to cap your follies you showed yourself as completely captivated with the splendor of her name as with that of her person, and cherished with incredible levity everything that sounded like it. And this is the reason you so ardently desired the Imperial or poet's laurel [*laurea*], for that was her name, and from the moment you first met her hardly a song has escaped you without mention of the laurel." "Finally, since you could not hope for the Imperial you set your heart upon the poet's crown, of which the distinction of your learning held out a promise. And you loved and longed for that with as little modesty as you had longed for lady Laura herself." Francesco would object that he began his poetical studies before he knew Laura, and had coveted the laurel chaplet from boyhood, and that without the inspiration of her name he would scarcely have overcome the many obstacles and dangers which stood between him and his coronation at Rome. This, his Confessor declares, is but one of the excuses which passion always finds; it is unworthy of a serious answer. The miserable results of love have been sufficiently illustrated, of which the chief is that it separates us from God and things divine, for how can a soul bent under the burden of such evils drag itself to the one pure fountain of true good?

"I am worsted," Francesco exclaims,—*Victus sum fateor*—“all these ills which you have depicted are, I perceive, but excerpts from my own book of experience.” “What am I to do?”

It is needless for Augustine to say that the subject of the remedies of love has been treated by famous philosophers and poets; there are whole books on the question. It would, too, be an insult

⁵I. e., Simone Memmi. Cf. Sonnet *Per mirar.*

to one who professes himself a master of ancient literature to indicate to him where these works may be found.

Cicero's suggestion, and Ovid's, that an old passion may be driven out by a new one *tanquam clavum clavo*, is not without its dangers, and, moreover, Francesco asserts that he can never love another than Laura. Then let him seek distraction in travel. Francesco replies that he has tried this resource repeatedly; while he has assigned various motives for his endless wanderings and his frequent sojourns in the country, liberty was always his real object. He had sought it far and wide but in vain, for he always carried his troubles with him. Augustine admits that a previous change of heart is after all indispensable. He would nevertheless better leave Avignon at least and betake himself to his Italy, whose skies and hills exercise over him an unrivaled fascination. He has too long been an exile from his country and himself.

"Have you looked into your mirror lately?" Augustine abruptly asks. "Does not your face change from day to day? Are there not already scattered gray hairs about your temples?" Francesco has noted these, but he sees the same thing when he looks at those of the same age about him. He does not know why people grow old sooner than they once did. Here Petrarch characteristically mentions a few instances of early gray hairs among the ancients. Augustine regards these examples as worse than irrelevant and as tending to lead one to disregard the signs of approaching death. He says impatiently that if he had referred to baldness, doubtless Francesco would have instanced Julius Caesar. Of course he would have mentioned Caesar, Petrarch replies; and if he had but one eye, he would take pleasure in recalling Hannibal and Philip of Macedon. He uses these examples, like his household furniture, to afford him simple daily comfort. "Had you upbraided me for being afraid of thunder, since I could not deny that I was, I should have replied that Augustus Caesar suffered from the same trouble. Indeed, herein lies by no means the least important reason for my cherishing the laurel, which they say is never struck by lightning."

Consider, Augustine urges in conclusion, not only the uncertainty of life and the imminence of death. "Think shame to yourself that you are pointed at and have become a subject of gossip with the common herd. Think how ill your morals harmonize with your profession. Think how your mistress has injured you in soul, body and estate. Consider how much you have needlessly suffered

for her sake. Think how often you have been deluded, despised and neglected; what blandishments, tears and lamentations you have poured out, and of the haughty ungrateful arrogance with which she received them. If there was the least indication of humanity in her conduct, how trifling it was, more fleeting than the summer breeze. Consider how you have added to her fame and what she has taken from your life; how anxious you have been for her good name, how careless of your welfare she has always shown herself. Think how through her you have been alienated from the love of God." . . . "Consider the useful and honorable tasks which you have so long neglected, the many incomplete works which lie before you and which demand your whole energy, not merely the odd moments which your passion leaves free. . . . If the honor of true glory does not attract you nor ignominy deter you, let the shame of others induce you to make a change in your life. You should guard your good name, if for no other reason, at least to save your friends the disgrace of telling lies for your sake."

"Lastly, what is it that you long for so ardently? Consider it intently, practically. Few there be who when once they have imbibed the sweet poison of desire, really manfully, I will not say consistently, dwell upon the foulness of woman's person. Their minds consequently easily relapse, under the pressure of nature, into the old habits." Forget the past. Importune heaven with your prayers and permit no day or night to pass without tearful supplication, for perchance omnipotence may take compassion upon you and bring your trial to an end.

It is only by remembering the general condemnation of the love of woman among the ecclesiastical class, which was, up to Petrarch's time, nearly synonymous with the literary class, that we can understand the general form which the discussion takes in the dialogue just outlined. It is his pure affection for a pure woman which fills Petrarch with apprehension. He consciously omits important considerations peculiar to his own case. One possible vague reference to his connection with the church occurs; none at all to the fact that the object of his devotion was, as we may assume, a married woman. If Laura was unmarried, the arguments against the attachment become still more unnatural, as measured by a modern or secular standard. Of that liaison, which resulted in two illegitimate children, no notice is taken, although it would seem a natural subject for animadversion by a confessor like Augustine. "The dialogue is

therefore," as I have said elsewhere, "a discussion of love at its best."⁶ The arguments which Petrarch puts in the mouth of St. Augustine are mainly conventional and monastic, with some suggestions of the interference with work which a literary bachelor would be likely to apprehend. The defence, on the other hand, is purely modern, modern enough fully to grasp and describe, even to defend, one of the noblest of man's attributes against the perversions of monasticism and the current theological speculation. But Petrarch was too thoroughly conservative in everything touching religion to reject a view so systematically inculcated by the church.

Augustine now turns to Francesco's longing for fame, which, with his passion for Laura, is the most inveterate and uncontrollable of his moral disorders. This yearning beyond measure for glory among men and an undying name may block his way to true immortality. He has no more grievous fault, although he may have uglier ones. What is fame? Nothing whatever but the general talk of the multitude about one; it is but a breath and, what is worst, the breath of the crowd. "I know whom I am addressing," Augustine continues. "You ordinarily regard nothing as more disgusting than the manners and doings of the common herd. What a want of consistency that you should habitually condemn the conduct of those whose chattering so delights you, nay more, to whom you look for the very consummation of your happiness! To what end are your unceasing labors, your tireless vigils and excessive attention to study? You may answer that you are learning what will help you to live better. But you long ago learned all that was necessary for both life and death. You would, therefore, better put the knowledge you have acquired into practice; better try experience rather than laborious ratiocination, which ever opens up new and inaccessible vistas; for there is no end to vain research. Recollect farther that you have given your attention to those things first and foremost which might be expected to gratify the public, and have sought to please them by a means especially distasteful to yourself, namely, by picking out from this poet and that historian such choice bits as might tickle the ears of your listeners."

⁶Robinson and Rolfe, *Petrarch, the First Modern Scholar and Man of Letters*, New York, 1898, pp. 96-97.

This accusation naturally irritates the scholar who has from boyhood scorned anthologies and favorite quotations. He cannot deny, however, that he does sometimes store up for the benefit of his friends and associates choice passages which he meets with.

"Not content with this daily occupation," Augustine proceeds, "which, although it took a great deal of time, promised you only a reputation among your contemporaries, you conceived of a fame which should reach posterity. Hence you undertook an historical work, covering the period from King Romulus to the Emperor Titus, a tremendous task requiring infinite patience and labor. Then, before this was done, infatuated by this craving for fame you set off on the wings of the poet for Africa. Now you diligently devote yourself to the several cantos of your poem by that name, without however giving up the other tasks, and so your life is divided into two great streams at least, not to speak of innumerable undercurrents. Prodigal of your most precious and irretrievable time, you write of others and forget yourself. Who knows but death may snatch the weary pen from your hand before either work is done?"

The last source of apprehension is by no means new to Francesco. He cannot bear to think of another laying hand to his *Africa*, and he confesses that in periods of bitter discouragement he has been on the point of burning the uncompleted manuscript. Augustine naturally recalls to him the melancholy truth that even if granting the most favorable circumstances he should succeed in producing a "rare and distinguished work," its fame could not reach far in time or space. Francesco impatiently asks to be spared the old trite reflections of the philosophers. "If you have any thing better to urge, pray produce it; all this sounds very fine but I have never found that it helped me. I do not ask to be God and possess eternity and fill heaven and earth. Human glory is enough for me. I do long for that. I am a mortal and I desire only the mortal." To Augustine's horrified deprecation of such doctrine and his condemnation of the rashness of those who recklessly postpone their supreme interests to their last failing years, Francesco sturdily replies: "There is a certain justification for my plan of life. It may be only glory that we seek here, but I persuade myself that, so long as we remain here, that is right. Another glory awaits us in heaven and he who reaches there will not wish even to think of earthly fame.

So this is the natural order, that among mortals the care of things mortal should come first; to the transitory will then succeed the eternal; from the first to the second is the natural progression.⁷ After this audacious and historically remarkable statement of the Humanists' creed, Francesco humbly asks if Augustine would have him forsake his studies altogether and lead an inglorious existence, or shall he pursue some middle course. His Confessor replies that we do not live inglorious lives although we follow, not fame but virtue; for true fame is but the shadow of virtue. "Throw off the burden of your proposed *Roman History*," Augustine exclaims, "lay aside your *Africa*, which cannot increase the fame of your Scipio or yourself. . . . Turn your thoughts upon Death! Let everything about you recall your pending fate. The heavens, the earth and the sea all change, what chance that man, the weakest of creatures, should hold his own? Let the setting sun and the waning moon teach their lesson of mortality. Contemplate the graves of your friends. *Hoc iter est in patriam.*"

Petrarch does not deny that this is wholesome advice, but he firmly refuses to give up his literary tasks, which he cannot with equanimity leave half done. He promises sedulously to die unto himself, and will hasten to complete his books in order to devote himself exclusively to religious contemplation. It will be seen that he found little to urge against Augustine's views, but that he nevertheless refused to follow his advice, except so far as he might do so without interfering with what he rightly considered his life's work.

Petrarch, in spite of his conventional, even ardent respect for the monkishness of his age, was after all too genuine and independent a thinker not to turn against some of its implications. He never consented to give up his secular literary pursuits or to admit that they were unholy. We have seen too how passionately he could maintain the legitimacy of this love against the aspersions of asceti-

⁷ *Franciscus.* Est autem aliqua propositi mei ratio. Eam enim quam hic sperare licet gloriam, hic quoque manenti querendam esse persuadeo ipse mihi. Illa maiore in coelo fruendum erit, quo qui pervenerit hanc terrenam ne cogitare quidem velit. Itaque istum esse ordinem ut mortalium rerum inter mortales prima sit cura: transitoris aeterna succedant: quod ex his ad illa sit ordinatissimus progressus: inde autem regressus ad ista non pateat. Ed. of 1496, *Colloquium tertii diei*, k (the pages are unnumbered).

cism. He frankly admits that he could never overcome the longing for personal glory which he hoped to secure by his Latin writings. The proud boasts of Horace and Ovid, who claimed immortality for their works, suggested to his eager, restless spirit something very different from the self-annihilation of the cloister. Whether he really believed such aspirations to be incompatible with Christian humility is difficult to decide. Late in life he did not hesitate to celebrate the Triumph of Glory in Italian verse. In a well-known letter to Boccaccio he vigorously dissuades him from yielding to spiritual intimidation. "Neither exhortations to virtue nor the argument of approaching death should divert us from literature; for in a good mind it excites the love of virtue and dissipates or at least diminishes the fear of death. To desert our studies shows want of self-confidence rather than wisdom; for letters do not hinder, but aid, the properly constituted mind which possesses them; they facilitate our life, they do not retard it.⁸ Finally, in the most beautiful and touching perhaps of his letters, written but a year before his death, to his old friend Boccaccio,⁹ he says:

"There is no lighter burden nor more agreeable than a pen. Other pleasures fail us, or wound us while they charm; but the pen we take up rejoicing and lay down with satisfaction, for it has the power to advantage not only its lord and master, but many others as well, even though they be far away, sometimes, indeed, though they be not born for thousands of years to come. I believe that I speak the strict truth when I claim that as there is none among earthly delights more noble than literature, so there is none more lasting, none gentler or more faithful."

So, without ability to defend completely the modern belief that earnest toil is presumably a far more rational preparation for death than is a paralyzing contemplation of its horrors, Petrarch still worked bravely on until the pen dropped from his hand. There is something noble and pathetic in this sturdy, unflagging industry in the face of the discomfiting suggestions of monasticism. His life transcended and belied those ideals of his age from which in his less exuberant moments he was unable entirely to free himself.

JAMES HARVEY ROBINSON

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

⁸Ep. Sen., I. 4.

⁹Ep. Sen., XVI. 2.

HONOR IN THE SPANISH DRAMA

(Continued from page 258)

A SEARCH for plays containing conceptions of honor similar to the *Celestina* proves futile until the advent of Torres Naharro. His play *Imenea*, published in 1517, treats of the *pundonor* in quite a Calderonian spirit. Imenea loves Febea and begs her to admit him to her graces. The marquis, a brother of Febea, arrives on the scene and suspects that there has been love-making. Febea finally receives her lover, and the servants guard the door; but they run away at the approach of the marquis, leaving a cloak which betrays all. The brother, offended in his honor, is going to put Febea and her lover to death. They both admit his right to do so, but they are finally pardoned. The quick suspicion of the brother and his resolve to put both his sister and lover to death are quite Calderonian, as Ticknor has pointed out. It may be added that his calmness and his reasons for putting her to death, not for vengeance but because the family has been injured, foreshadow the heroes of the dramas of almost a hundred years later. The marquis says to his sister, without anger:

Pues que os parece, señora, para tan gran deshonor, habeis sido tan guardada? Confesaos con este paje, que conviene que murais, pues con la vida ensuciais un tan antiguo linage.

When Febea begs for the life of her lover, she points out that if he is killed her wrongdoing will become public. This immediately brings to mind the great desire on the part of Calderón's characters to conceal all stains on their honor. They fear publicity more than the blemish itself.

We have, then, an early play which is striking in regard to the *pundonor*; but the question is complicated by the fact that this play was written, played and published in Italy about 1517, and I hope to prove that much of Lope's and Calderón's inspiration in regard to honor came from Italy, or at least, that Italian dramatists preceded them in their ideas about honor. While this play is built about a question of honor, the influence of this drama is greatly

discounted. "The accident that Torres Naharro's *Propaladia* was printed in Italy; the misfortune that its Spanish reprints were tardy, and that his plays were too complicated for the primitive resources of the Spanish stage: these delayed the development of the Spanish theatre by close on a century."²⁵ The *Imenea*, therefore, can hardly be said to be the source of the *pundonor* for Spanish drama. There are no plays like it for about a quarter of a century, and Ticknor's statement, quoted above, implying that ideas of honor are found in Spanish drama from Torres Naharro onward, must be modified. He is the first dramatist to introduce the *pundonor*, but there is by no means an unbroken continuation of the theme. Nor can the circumstances attending the producing of this play be forgotten. It was written by a Spaniard—in Italy.

The earliest Spanish drama which I have found, after Torres Naharro, containing strictly Calderonian sentiments in regard to honor is *El Infamador* by Juan de la Cueva, whose works were played in 1579 and published in 1588. *El Infamador* has falsely accused Elidora of murdering one of his servants and of having been his mistress. She is put in prison and her father sends her poison, justifying the act in the following monologue, which is remarkably Calderonian in its sentiments concerning honor:

Rompa la voz de mi lloroso acento
 Las sidéreas regiones, oiga el mundo
 Mi mal, y la crueza que hoy intento.
 Y nadie entienda qu'en crueza fundo
 Dar á mi hija muerte, cual dar quiero,
 Ni que me inspira furia del profundo;
 Que yo no tengo el corazon de acero
 Ni naci de los riscos, ni montañas,
 Ni me crió dragon, ni tigre fiero.
 Hombre soy, de hombre tengo las entrañas,
 Tiernamente, cual hombre, me lastimo
 Y lloro mis fatigas tan estrañas.
 Mas deste sentimiento me reprimio,
 Viéndome por mi hija en tal afrenta
 Que su muerte no siento, y mi honra estimo.
 Y así aunque muera es causa que no sienta

²⁵ Fitzmaurice-Kelly, *op. cit.*, p. 135.

Con la terneza que debia su muerte,
Viendo ser ella la que así me afrenta.
Ejemplo es este que al varon mas fuerte
Y de mayor constancia pondrá espanto
Y le hará dudar la estraña suerte.

Pudo el honor de Ipodamante tanto
Viendo su hija, de Archeloo, forzada,
Que le dió muerte, sin oir su llanto.
Orcamo enterró viva su hija amada,
Porque le robó Apolo su pureza,
Dándola así á suo honor sacrificada.

¿ Pues si destos se canta por grandeza,
Dar á sus hijas muerte por su honra,
Dársela yo á la mia no es cacea?
Que no me ofenda menos, ni deshonra
La maldad que me hija ha cometido,
Si la nobleza de quien soy me honra.

Al fin yo estó en que muere resumido
En la prison, pues ha de morir cierto
Por justicia, su término cumplido.

Así será mi daño mas cubierto,
Que no verla sacar de las prisiones
A justiciar, el dia descubierto.

Jornada ii.

In this play, therefore, and in the golden age of Spanish drama which follows, we find this conception of honor. From where, however, do these sentiments come? It has been shown that honor was of great importance in the life of both Spain and Italy. But why did this particular form of literature choose the honor-question for treatment? One reason is that the complications brought about by the ideal of honor are intensely dramatic and form excellent material for plays. But as has already been said, such movements in literature are generally slower in formation than this one has seemed to be. The solution of the question is to be found, I believe, in the Italian drama of the sixteenth century. Here we find the traces, the modest beginnings of the ideas of honor which were to be developed later by the cleverer Spanish dramatists to such an extent that they have been surprising to later generations.

Let us point out the parallel passages in the earlier Italian

dramas. The simile of the pure crystal is one which is common in Spanish drama to show the frailty of honor. In *La Vida es Sueño* honor is said to be

De materia tan frágil
Que con una accion se quiebra
—O se mancha con un aire.

Act iii.

The same idea is expressed by Dolce in his *Giocasta* (1549):

E qual tenero fior, ch'ad ogni fato
Di picciol' aura s'ammarisce e muore.

Act i.

In Rucellai's *Rosmunda*—a play which saw light about the same time as the well known *Sophonisba* and which is therefore a very early drama—the following ideas on honor are found:

Io non ricuso di morir, Signore,
Pur ch'io salvi l'onore.

Act ii.

E non è cosa alcuna sì cara
Si debba custodir quanto l'onore,
Il qual con molta cura e diligenzia
Si pena ad acquistar molti et molt' anni;
Et a perderlo poi vi basta un' ora.
Questo come si perde, a noi non resta,
Che perder altro, ed è di tal costume,
Ch'ei non si lassa racquisitar più mai.

Act iii.

This is worthy of a heroine of Calderon.

The king, Sulmone, in Giraldi's *Orbecche* (1541) points out how frail a thing is honor, saying:

Nè scorno è questo, che per poca pena
Si possa cancellar da l'onor mio.

Act iii, sc. 3.

His honor has been stained, and he exclaims:

Questi ha macchiato il mio sangue e l'onore,
E la real corona; ma stia certo,
Che sì nel sangue suo Sulmon le mani,
Si bagnerà che ne sarà lavata
Tutta questa vergogna, e questa inguria.

Act iii, sc. 3.

The stain, the washing with blood, recall Spanish sentiments, as for example in Calderón's *Médico de su Honra*:

que el honor
Con sangre, señor, se lava.

Jornada iii.

In Sperone Speroni's *Canace* (1542) we find that the son and daughter of Eolus have had a child born to them. Eolus sends a dagger to his daughter with which to kill herself. He shows the cruelty of a Spanish father, and justifies his act by the same reasons:

Mora per nostro onore
L'infamia del mio regno. . . . Che avendo la malizia
De' tuoi figioli ucciso il nostro onore.

Act iv.

The example of a husband merely suspecting his wife of unfaithfulness without any proof of her wrongdoing is furnished in Giraldi's *Arrenopia* (1563). The husband cries out against his torment in true Spanish fashion:

Se tu sapessi, che pungente spina
Porti nel cor colui, che l'onor vede
Macchiato de la Donna a lei congiunto,
E che di lui la parte migliore era. . . .

Act i, sc. i.

Fra quanti affanni, e quante angosce ponno
Assalto dare ad una umana mente,
Nulla ve n'ha, ch più tormenti e affligga
L'uomo, che cura tien de l'onor suo,
Che sospetto, ch'egli abbia de la moglie.

Act ii, sc. i.

The mere suspicion is significant. Calderón makes much of such a situation. In this play the husband does not reach the limit of cruelty attained by the husband in *El Médico de su Honra*. He does not kill his wife; but even this extreme form of what may be called honor-madness, which has attracted so much attention in Calderón's drama of *El Médico*, is wholly and plainly justified in Dolce's *Marianna* (1555). The heroine, Marianna, is entirely innocent and chaste; but Erode jealously suspects that she is guilty

of having broken her faith. A friend tries every argument to make Erode at least give his wife the benefit of the doubt; but he is deaf to all reasoning and entreaties, saying:

Io sono offeso nel mio proprio onore,
E l'offesa è palese.

Act iii.

The publicity of any stain on honor has already been mentioned as being greatly feared by characters of Lope and Calderón. Erode like *El Médico de su Honra* reasons out what he should do. There is no rage, no thirst for vengeance as in the Italian *novelle*. Also, like the Physician, he loves his wife deeply. He says in a significant monologue in deciding whether he shall kill Marianna or not:

Che d'una parte mi retiene amore,
Et d'altra la ragione mi volge e sprona:
Nè son ben risoluto, qual di due
Portar debba vittoria del mio core.

Ma conchiudo, che quando io non avessi
In Marianna mia, fuor che sospetto,
Questo ad ogni empietà devrebbe indurmi
Contra di lei; ch' a la persona mia
Non sol convien, che non si faccia offesa,
Ma torre ogni cagion, ch' altri sospetti.

Act iii.

In such lines is the source, not necessarily of *El Médico de su Honra* itself, but of plays in such a cruel vein depending upon the *pundonor* for their interest. Nor is it far from such sentiments to that refinement of honor expressed in *El Galan Fantasma*:

De una condición tan frágil,
Que en su opinion su concepto
Bastó haber imaginado
Que fué agravio, para serlo.

Jorn. i, esc. 2.

As for the revulsion of feeling and the protest against the hard laws of honor which occur so often in Spanish drama, the same ideas are found in Italian drama. In Tasso's *Aminta* a whole chorus of the first act contains an invective against honor. The Age of Gold is praised:

Ma sol, perchè quel vano
Nome senza soggetto;
Quell' idolo d' errore, idol d' inganno;
Quel che dal volgo insano
Onor poscia fu detto

had not come to corrupt people. Honor is personified as in Lope's *El Médico de su Honra* and is called: *di nostra natura il feo tiranno*. Guarini introduces the same subject in the *Pastor Fido*:

Quel suon fastoso e vano,
Quell' inutil soggetto
Di lusinghe, di titoli e d' inganno,
Ch' Onor dal volgo insano
Indegnamente è detto,
Non era ancor degli animi tiranno.

Act iv.

Also we find in Ongaro's *Alceo* a similar outburst:

O che felice amare esser dovea
Prima che questa falsa opinione
Che da l'ignaro volgo è detta Onore,
Entrasse ne le menti de' mortali!

Act ii, sc. 2.

The following exhortation occurs in the chorus of the first act:

Lasciate, semplicette
Pescatrici, gli orgogli
E le bugiarde idolatrie d'Onore.

The other conception of honor, that held by the philosophers and set forth in their treatises, is also reflected in these Italian dramas; but it is always opposed to the so-called Calderonian conception. Aretino in the *Filosopho* ridicules the philosophical views in regard to the treatment of wayward wives. The Philosopher replies to his wife when she demands pardon:

Io con lo abbracciarti faccio segno, che di ciò ti ringrazio ex corde, conciossiachè nel chiedermi la indulgenzia, ch'io ti concedo, cresce in me dignità de la clemenza; . . . io che mi son teco vendicato con il rimetterti la inguria, con che tu avessi potuto toccarmi l'onore etc. . . . Act v.

This was evidently supposed to arouse laughter, and it would be

interesting to see how a modern audience would receive a like outcome of the same situation and similar sentiments, philosophical and Christian as they may be.

Urrea points out in his dialogue that the adulterer should be given up to justice,²⁶ and Susio holds the same view.²⁷ Damonio, in Ariosto's *I Suppositi*, hearing of the downfall of his daughter, muses as to what he should do with her betrayer:

Come debb' io di così grave inguria
Ahi lasso vendicarmi? se supplicio
Darò a costui, secondo i suoi demeriti,
E che ricerca l'ira mia giustissima,
Io ne sarò da le leggi, e dal Principe
Punito; ch' a un privato non è lecito
Farsi ragion d'autorità sua propria.

Act iii.

Just as the confidant of Erode in *Marianna* tries to reason with the jealous husband, so Malecche, confidant of Sulmone, reflects the attitude of the authors in the treatises in *Orbecche*. He is against vengeance because penitence follows in its wake:

. E se pur questo
Poco in voi può, che devria poter molto,
Muovavi il vostro onor, che (com' ho detto)
Essere non vi può se non disnore
Così fatta vendetta. . . .

Act iii, sc. 2.

Such views are merely the reverse of those which triumph. They are introduced to make possible the dramatic conflict between two opposed forces. Although one would hardly expect to find them prevailing in Spanish literature, yet a passage in *Persiles y Sigismunda* shows that Cervantes was acquainted with the Italian philosopher's opinions:

Volved en vos (dice un personaje al marido agravido), y dando lugar á la misericordia, no Carráis tras la justicia. Y no os aconsejo por esto que perdonéis á vuestra mujer, para volverla á vuestra casa, que á esto no hay ley que os obligue. Lo que os aconsejo es que la dejéis, que es el mayor castigo que podeis darle. Vivid lejos de

²⁶ *Op. cit.*, p. 128.

²⁷ *Op. cit.*, p. 84.

ella y viviréis, lo que no haréis estando juntos, porque moriréis continuo. La ley del repudio fué muy usada entre los ronanos, y puesto que sería mayor caridad perdonarla, recogerla, sufrirla y aconsejarla, es menester tomar el pulso á la paciencia y poner en un punto extremado á la discrecion, de la cual pocos se pueden fiar en esta vida . . . y finalmente, quiero, que consideréis que vais á hacer un pecado mortal en quitarles las vidas, que no se ha de cometer por todas las ganancias que el mundo atesora.

Rubio y Lluch, in commenting on this passage, ascribes the views expressed in it to the fact that Cervantes was ahead of his times; but these same opinions had been expressed by Possevini half a century earlier, as has been shown above. The similarity of the two passages is striking. Both authors advise the husband to live apart from his wife; both mention the custom of divorce among the ancients. In saying that the killing of a woman is a mortal sin, Cervantes recalls Torquemada and thus gives a reason more typically Spanish and one which would have more weight in Spain.

The priority of these two different conceptions of honor in Italy seems unquestionable; and we believe that the Spanish drama owes much to the Italian drama in regard to the use of the ideal of honor as dramatic material. Lope and Calderón gave this element much more prominence, sometimes exaggerating it to an absurdity; but they were better builders of plays than the Italians, and they saw

Since this article has gone to press, Dr. G. T. Northup has called my attention to the fact that Tirso, in his play *El celoso prudente*, has named his hero Sancho Urrea. Perhaps Tirso had in mind Jerónimo Urrea, the author of the honor treatise, for the Urrea of the play does not wipe out the stain on his honor with blood, but employs tactics of secrecy and silence more in accordance with ideas of Jerónimo Urrea, who states in the preface of his book that Spanish soldiers are imitating a barbarous *Italian* custom, and he is writing his book out of humanitarian motives. The change in the first names was probably made by the dramatist in order to introduce a pun on the proverb *A buen callar llaman Sancho*. Dr. Northup has also pointed out that in Calderón's *Mujer, llora y vencerás*, the *gracioso*, Patin, speaks of not understanding the "fine foreign points of honor":

Mas yo, que soy un pobrete
Que no entiendo del honor
Las filigranas de allende . . .
(Hartzenbush edition, vol. III, p. 58a.)

plainly and made good use of the almost unlimited dramatic possibilities of the question of honor.²⁸

* The subject of this article was proposed by Prof. J. E. Spingarn, to whom I am indebted for many suggestions. The quotations from *El Médico de su Honra* were furnished by Dr. G. T. Northup.

DANIEL CLIVE STUART

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

THE DATE OF THE BIRTH OF BOCCACCIO

FOR the last thirty years the statement that Boccaccio was born in 1313 has been generally accepted. In this article it is shown that the proper statement is rather that he was born in 1313 or before July 20 in 1314. This slight revision is important for much of the chronology of the life of Boccaccio, since he dated many of his experiences in terms of age, and is of some special present interest in view of the approaching celebration of the six hundredth anniversary of his birth.

The sources of information as to the date of the birth of Boccaccio are two: a statement by Petrarch to the effect that Boccaccio was his junior by 9 years, and a statement by Filippo Villani as to Boccaccio's age at death.

The statement of Petrarch appears in the letters *De rebus senilibus*, Book VIII, Letter 1 (written July 20, 1366), and is as follows:

“sic si verum dicere solitus es, nec iuvenum more, aliquot ipse tibi quoque nunc annos subtrahis, ego te in nascendi ordine, nouem annorum spatio antecessi.”¹

The reading “nouem” is reliable.²

The words “ego . . . antecessi” may have any one of four connotations: first, “you were born on the 9th anniversary of my birth,” second, “you were born on the 9th anniversary of my birth or on one of the 364 days following,” third, “you were born within half a year of the 9th anniversary of my birth,” and fourth, “you

¹ Petrarch, *Opera quae extant omnia*, Basle, 1581, p. 830.

² Mr. J. F. Mason of Cornell has been so kind as to inform me that the editions of the *Opera omnia* of Venice 1501 and Venice 1503 both read “novem.” Develay, who utilized for his translation the MS. of the Bibliothèque Nationale and that of Toulouse, has “neuf” (V. Develay, *Lettres de Fr. Pétrarque à Jean Boccace*, Paris, 1891, pp. xviii-xix, 226). Fracassetti, who utilized for his translation the editions of the *Opera omnia* of Venice 1516 and Basle 1554, has “nove” (G. Fracassetti, *Lettere senili di Francesco Petrarca*, vol. I, Florence, 1869, pp. 2, 445). Manetti, referring to the passage about 1450, has “novem” (A. Solerti, *Le vite di Dante, Petrarca e Boccaccio scritte fino al secolo decimosesto*, Milan, 1904, p. 680).

were born in the calendar year subsequent by 9 to the calendar year of my birth." If the fourth connotation is the correct one, Petrarch may have had in mind the Roman civil year, beginning Jan. 1, or the year *ab incarnatione*, beginning March 25.³

The statement of Petrarch is entirely reliable. The questioning of Boccaccio's veracity is merely playful.⁴

Petrarch was born on July 20, 1304.⁵ If the words "ego . . . antecessi" have the first of the four connotations indicated as possible, they mean that Boccaccio was born on July 20, 1313. If they have the second connotation, they mean that his birth occurred in the period beginning July 20, 1313, and ending July 19, 1314. If they have the third connotation, they mean that his birth occurred in the period beginning with January, 1313, and ending with January, 1314. If they have the fourth connotation and Petrarch had in mind the Roman civil year, they mean that Boccaccio was born in 1313. If they have the fourth connotation and Petrarch had in mind the year *ab incarnatione*, they mean that Boccaccio was born in the period beginning March 25, 1313, and ending March 24, 1314. These several possible meanings being considered, the proper inference from the statement of Petrarch is that Boccaccio was born in 1313 or before July 20 in 1314.

The statement of Villani appears in his *De origine civitatis Florentiae et de eiusdem famosis civibus*, Book II, Life of Boccaccio. In the first redaction of the work (written in the period 1381-1388) the statement is as follows:

"Hic diem extremam obiit anno gratie .M.CCC.V. et .LXX., etatis sue sexagesimo secundo."⁶

In the later redaction (written in the period 1395-1397) the statement reappears without substantial alteration, as follows:

"Hic diem suum extremum obiit anno gratie MCCCLXX°V°, etatis sue sexagesimo et secundo."⁷

The MS. of the first redaction is an autograph.⁸

³A. Cappelli, *Cronologia e calendario perpetuo*, Milan, 1906, pp. xi-xvi.

⁴G. Körting, *Boccaccio's Leben und Werke*, Leipzig, 1880, p. 80.

⁵*Opera*, 1581, p. 829.

⁶A. F. Masséra, *Le più antiche biografie del Boccaccio*, in *Zeitschrift für rom. Phil.*, XXVII (1903), p. 313.

⁷*Ibid.*, p. 314.

⁸*Ibid.*, p. 303.

The words "anno . . . etatis sue sexagesimo secundo" mean properly "in the 62nd year of his age." In view of the fact that ordinal numerals were sometimes employed, in expressions of age, with the value of the corresponding cardinals,⁹ it is possible that they mean "being 62 years old." Investigation of Villani's use of ordinals in expressions of age shows that it is impossible to draw a decisive conclusion as to his meaning here. There are but three cases in which it is possible to control his usage: in two of these cases the ordinal is used with its proper value, and in the third case as equivalent to the corresponding cardinal. The cases are as follows. In the same work which contains the biography of Boccaccio there appears, in the Life of Petrarch, the following passage:

"Floruit . . . ab anno Domini millesimo trecentesimo quinto usque ad septuagesimum quartum, quo diem clausit extremum, etatis sua anno septuagesimo."¹⁰

In this passage the ordinal "septuagesimo" is evidently used with its proper value. In the same work there appears, in the Life of Dante, the following passage:

"Obiit poeta anno gratiae MCCCXXI idibus Septembrium quo die Sanctae Crucis solemnitas celebratur, dierum vitae sua anno sexto et quinquagesimo."¹¹

In Villani's Preface to his commentary on the *Divine Comedy*, Chapter IV, appears the following statement as to the birth of Dante:

"Vbi scire debemus, anno gratie millesimo ducentesimo sexagesimo quinto, exente maio, in hanc regionem caducorum venisse poetam."¹²

⁹ A. Gaspari, *Geschichte der Italienischen Literatur*, vol. II, Berlin, 1888, p. 636.

¹⁰ Solerti, p. 280. The reading is that of the second redaction (*ibid.*, pp. 82, 275). The notes, which contain the variant readings of the autograph MS. of the first redaction, contain no variants for the words quoted. In the original draft of the document the statement continued as follows: "cuius anni die prima quae fuit decima nona Julii." In accordance with a suggestion of Coluccio Salutati, Villani substituted for these words the following phrase: "et prima die anni septuagesimi primi" (G. Calò, *Filippo Villani e il 'Liber de origine civitatis Florentiae et eiusdem famosis civibus'*, Rocca S. Casciano, 1904, p. 151, n. 3).

¹¹ Solerti, p. 87. The reading is that of the second redaction. The notes contain no variants for the words cited.

¹² F. Villani, *Commento al primo canto dell' Inferno*, ed. G. Cugnomi, Città di Castello, 1896, p. 30.

In the comment on the first line of the *Divine Comedy* appears the following passage:

"Aiunt que, poetam annis quinquaginta sex et mensibus VI vite sue cursum, euentu uario, transegisse, opusque suum feliciter cepti-tasse anno gratie millesimo trecentesimo, anno scilicet iubilei, et in die ueneris sancti; et millesimo trecentesimo uigesimo primo de hac luce migrasse. Ex quorum fractione colligitur, poetam opus suum incoasse anno etatis sue ac vite trigesimo quinto."¹³

On comparison of these statements it is evident that the words "dierum vitae sua anno sexto et quinquagesimo" mean "being 56 years of age," and that the ordinal "trigesimo quinto" is used with its proper value.

Villani's statement as to Boccaccio's age at death is entirely reliable. The MS. of the first redaction was subjected to the revision of Coluccio Salutati, who corrected certain incorrect statements, and left this statement unaltered.¹⁴ Salutati was intimate with Boccaccio in his old age.¹⁵

Boccaccio died on Dec. 20 or 21, 1375.¹⁶ If the words "anno . . . etatis sue sexagesimo secundo" mean "in the 62nd year of his age," they imply that he was born in the period beginning Dec. 21, 1313, and ending Dec. 20, 1314. If they mean "being 62 years old," they imply that he was born in the period beginning Dec. 21, 1312, and ending Dec. 20, 1313. Both possible meanings being considered, the proper inference from the statement of Villani is that Boccaccio was born in the period beginning Dec. 21, 1312, and ending Dec. 20, 1314.

This conclusion is consistent with the conclusion derived from the statement of Petrarch, but is less precise. The final conclusion as to the date of the birth of Boccaccio is therefore identical with that derived from the statement of Petrarch, namely, that Boccaccio was born in 1313 or before July 20 in 1314.

The history of the statements as to the date of the birth of Boccaccio is, briefly, as follows.

Squarciafico (writing about 1465) states, without discussion,

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 84.

¹⁴ Massèra, p. 303.

¹⁵ C. Salutati, *Epistolario*, ed. F. Novati, vol. I, Rome, 1891, p. 223.

¹⁶ Körting, p. 349.

citation of evidence, or reference, that Boccaccio was born in 1313.¹⁷ So also (in the 16th century) Betussi,¹⁸ Sansovino,¹⁹ Dolce,²⁰ and Nicoletti.²¹ Pope-Blount²² and Negri²³ state, without discussion, citation of evidence, or reference, that Boccaccio was born in 1314. Manni states that Boccaccio was born in 1313 "giusta la comune asserzione, e non già nel 1314, come più altri sbagliando hanno scritto."²⁴ Mazzuchelli states that Boccaccio was born in 1313. In a note he writes: "Veramente il Pope-Blount . . . e il P. Negri scrivono che il Boccaccio nacque nel 1314; ma noi lo riputiamo un errore, perciocchè veggiamo (here the statement of Petrarch is cited) . . . e ciò ben s'accorda colla comune asserzione che il Boccaccio morisse in età di LXII. anni nel 1375."²⁵ Tiraboschi states that Boccaccio was born in 1313, and adduces the statement of Petrarch.²⁶

Baldelli states that Boccaccio was born in 1313, adduces the statement of Petrarch, and adds: "E Matteo Palmieri nel riferire all' anno 1375 la morte del Boccaccio soggiunge, *e vita migravit aetatis sua anno sexagesimo secundo* (Mann., p. 130)."²⁷ The statement of Palmieri was not written until the middle of the 15th century, and is the only reference to Boccaccio in the work in which it appears. It has no more value as evidence than the contemporary statement of Squarciafico,—that is, none at all.

Witte states that Boccaccio was born in 1313, and adduces the

¹⁷ Solerti, p. 695.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 703.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 713.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 720.

²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 734.

²² T. Pope-Blount, *Censura celebriorum autorum*, London, 1690, p. 308.

²³ G. Negri, *Istoria degli scrittori fiorentini*, Ferrara, 1722, p. 269.

²⁴ D. M. Manni, *Istoria del Decamerone di Giovanni Boccaccio*, Florence, 1742, p. 1.

²⁵ G. M. Mazzuchelli, *Gli scrittori d' Italia*, vol. II, part III, Brescia, 1753, p. 13.

²⁶ G. Tiraboschi, *Storia della letteratura italiana*, vol. V, Rome, 1783, p. 480.

²⁷ G. B. Baldelli, *Vita di Giovanni Boccacci*, Florence, 1806, p. 370. Manni quotes the statement of Palmieri in his chapter on the death of Boccaccio. The exact form of the statement of Palmieri is: "1375 . . . Iohannes Boccaccius, vir ameni ingenii et latina patriaque facundia in scribendo celebris, *e vita migravit aetatis anno LXII*" (*Raccolta degli storici italiani*, vol. XXVI, part I, fasc. 64, 1903, p. 117).

statement of Petrarch.²⁸ Corazzini writes: "Messer Giovanni Boccaccio essendo nato tra il 1313 e il 1314 . . ." He gives no discussion, citation of evidence, or reference.²⁹ Landau states that Boccaccio was born in 1313, and adduces the statements of Petrarch and of Palmieri.³⁰ Körting states that Boccaccio was born in 1313, adduces the statement of Petrarch, and adds: "Damit stimmt, wenigstens ungefähr, auch Palmieri's Angabe überein, dass Boccaccio 1375 im 62. Jahre seines Alters gestorben sei."³¹

Crescini states that Boccaccio was born in 1313, and adduces the statements of Petrarch, Villani, and Palmieri. To the statement of Villani he refers in the words: "raccontando che il Boccaccio morì nel 1375 d' anni 62."³² These words do not represent accurately the actual words of Villani.

Gaspary states that Boccaccio was born in 1313, adduces the statements of Petrarch, Villani, and Palmieri, and adds, with reference to the statements of Villani and of Palmieri: "danach wäre er nach d. 21. Dec. 1313 geboren; aber die Humanisten redeten bei diesen Bestimmungen oft ungenau, und jene meinten vielleicht 'zu 62 Jahren.'"³³

Hauvette accepts 1313 as the date of the birth of Boccaccio. In his *Recherches sur le 'De casibus illustrium virorum' de Boccace* he writes, in the course of a discussion of the date of Boccaccio's letter *Miraberis, miles egregie*, which contains the words "sexagesimum annum ago": "Toute la question se réduit à savoir si l'anniversaire de sa naissance tombait avant ou après le 28 août, autrement dit, si Boccace était né dans un des huit premiers mois de 1313 ou dans un des quatre derniers; dans le premier cas, il était dans sa soixantième année le 28 août 1372. Il est difficile de rien affirmer sur ce point, il paraît cependant plus probable que Boccace était né dans la première moitié de 1313 (c., V. Crescini, *Contrib. agli studi sul Boccaccio*, p. 40-41)."³⁴ The ascription of

²⁸ K. Witte, trans. *Decameron*, Leipzig, 1827, p. xv.

²⁹ F. Corazzini, *Le lettere edite e inedite di Giovanni Boccaccio*, Florence, 1877, p. xi.

³⁰ M. Landau, *Giovanni Boccaccio*, Stuttgart, 1877, p. 3.

³¹ Körting, pp. 80-81.

³² V. Crescini, *Contributo agli studi sul Boccaccio*, Turin, 1887, p. 1.

³³ Gaspary, vol. II, pp. 1, 636.

³⁴ H. Hauvette, *Recherches sur le 'De casibus illustrium virorum' de Boccace*, in *Entre camarades*, Paris, 1901, p. 293.

this opinion to Crescini is unwarranted. In the passage referred to, Crescini notes incidentally the possibility that Boccaccio's birth occurred early in 1313, and utilizes this possibility as one of several independent arguments against an argument of his opponents as to the place of Boccaccio's birth, but he does not indicate that he has any opinion or that there is any basis for opinion as to the part of the year in which Boccaccio was born. In *Una confessione del Boccaccio*, Hauvette states that Boccaccio was probably born in the first half of 1313, and refers to Crescini and to his own *Recherches*.³⁵

Della Torre accepts 1313 as the date of the birth of Boccaccio, referring to Crescini.³⁶ In the course of his work he writes, without discussion, citation of evidence, or reference: "giacché, come è noto, egli nacque dentro la prima metà del 1313."³⁷

Hutton transfers and abbreviates Crescini's statements as to the date of the birth, and gives the date as 1313 in the text of his work and in his Chronological Appendix. In a note, however, he attacks the reliability of the statement of Petrarch, suggesting that Boccaccio may have lied to Petrarch as to the year of his birth, selecting a year in the period of his father's residence in France in order to be consistent with certain passages of disguised autobiographical narrative in the *Filocolo* and the *Ameto* in which it is implied—perhaps falsely, according to Hutton—that he was born in France.³⁸ The veracity of the story of Boccaccio's birth in France was definitively established by Crescini.³⁹

E. H. WILKINS

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

³⁵ Hauvette, *Una confessione del Boccaccio*, trans. G. Gigli, Florence, 1905, pp. 16-17.

³⁶ A. Della Torre, *La giovinezza di Giovanni Boccaccio*, Città di Castello, 1905, p. 1.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 126.

³⁸ E. Hutton, *Giovanni Boccaccio*, London, 1909, p. 9, n. 5.

³⁹ Crescini, pp. 1-44.

THE DEVIL AS A DRAMATIC FIGURE IN THE SPANISH RELIGIOUS DRAMA BEFORE LOPE DE VEGA

(Continued from page 312)

HELL was usually represented on the stage as a cave. In (*Ili*) *Ynbidia*, after urging Cain to kill his brother, says, ll. 166-7:

Yo me voy para la cueva
de Satan terrible y fiero.

In (*XVIII*) Bobo asks Culpa where she lives, and she replies, ll. 156-7:

En la cueva que mirais
es mi posada.

In (*XIV*) after Lucifer, Satanas and Caron have determined to summon *Género Humano* before God, Lucifer says, ll. 131-2:

Pues, sus, sin mas detener
Entremos en el ynfierno.

The cave evidently sloped downward. In (*XVIII*) *Captividad* threatens the Bobo with prison and he objects, saying, l. 194, *No bajaré*, and again, l. 200, *Que no he gana de abajar*. In l. 443 *Captividad* says to Bobo, *Ea, baja tu aca, patan*.

The cave was dark. In (*IV*), ll. 283-4, Abel says as he is carried to Hell:

O que grande escuridad
despoblada de alegría!

Schack quotes from a manuscript work entitled *Ceremonial de la Santa Iglesia de Huesca* the following passage concerning the representation of Hell:

Item á 15 de Enero de 1582, por mandato de los señores del Cabildo, dí á su platero ciciliano ciento diez y seis sueldos para hacer una boca de infierno y unos vestidos y cetros y otras cosillas para la representación de la noche de Navidad como parece por una cuenta de su mano. Mas le dí por su trabajo que estuvo diez días ó más ocupado en hacellos ochenta sueldos por las dos partidas, 190s. . . . Mas pagué á un escopetero por los cohetes y duxidores que hizo para la dicha representación ocho reales, y más pagué de encordar dos

orguelas para la dicha fiesta, 8s. por las tres partidas LXXVIII sueldos.¹²

In (IX), l. 439ff., Hell is represented as a medieval fortress:

Satanas. Dejadme subir a mi
juntamente con mi paje
a la torre el omenaje,
que si alguno aca viniere,
descrecio de mi linaje
si en llegando no muriere.
Yo hare quanto pudiere
con coraje y sin rreyertas.

Lucifer. Entrad y cerrad las puertas,
atracad bien los postigos,
y esforçaos bien, amigos,
que las pendencias son ciertas.

In the *Auto de la Resurrecion de Christo*, pub. by Rouanet, *op. cit.*, Vol. III, l. 210ff., la Ynocencia de Adan relates the scenes in Hell after Christ had freed the damned souls:

Mas, como el señor entro,
el demonio s'escondio
debajo de unos tiçones,
y el quebrinos las prisiones,
y ansi a todos nos solto.

And again in the same play, ll. 218-24:

Con dos puntapies
dio con las puertas en tierra.
Luego vieraſ por el suelo
diablos, qu'es cosa que enbaça
el contarlo, juro al cielo!
Hasta el diablillo cojuelo
se escondio en una hornaça.

In (XXIII) we have a fairly complete description of the tor-

¹² *Historia de la literatura y del arte dramático en España*, Vol. I, p. 383-4. It is likely that the rockets were carried by the devil. In the English Morality, *Castle of Perseverance* (1400), the Devil was provided with fireworks consisting of gun powder in tubes and carried on different parts of the body. In Heywood's *Play of Love* (1553), "The Vice cometh in running with a huge tank on his head full of squibs fired." See L. Cushman, *op. cit.*, p. 40.

ments which await the souls of the damned, some of which may be reminiscences of the Inferno of Dante. It is impossible to say whether the various objects were represented on the stage but it is likely that some crude representation was attempted. Diabo, the boatman of Hell, addresses as follows the various characters who appear before him:

p. 273. Veis aquellos fuegos bien?
Allí se coge la frol.
Veis aquel gran fumo espeso,
Que sale daquellas peñas?
Allí perdereis el vueso,
Y mas, Señor, os confieso
Que habeis de mensar las greñas.

p. 276. Veis aquella puente ardiendo,
Muy lejos allén del mar,
Y unas ruedas volviendo
De navajas, y heriendo?
Pues allí habeis de andar
Siempre jamas.

p. 279. *Rei* Y por mar he de pasar?
Diabo Si, y aun tiene que sudar;
Ca no fue nada el morir.
Pasmareis:
Si mirais, dahi vereis
Adó sereis morador
Naquellos fuegos que veis:
Y llorando, cantareis
“ Nunca fue pena mayor.”

p. 286. De ahí donde estais vereis
Unas calderas de pez,
Adonde os cocereis,
Y la corona asareis,
Y freireis la vejez.¹⁸

p. 290. Vuestra Señoría irá
En cien mil pedazos hecho:

³³ Cf. Dante, *Inferno*, XXI, 16-18:

Tal, non per fuoco ma per divina arte
Bollia laggiuso una pegola spessa
Che inviscava la ripa da ogni parte.

Y para siempre estará
En agua que herverá,
Y nunca sereis deshecho.

p. 292.

Oyes aquel gran ruido
Nel lago de los leones?
Despertad bien el oido:
Vos sereis allí comido
De canes y de dragones.¹⁴

pp. 295-6.

Veis aquellos azotar
Con vergas de hierro ardiendo,
Y despues atanazar?
Pues allí habeis de andar
Para siempre padeciendo.¹⁵

The Devil is represented as the arch enemy of Mankind and the instigator of all evil actions. The chief motive for this enmity was that man had been redeemed by Christ, while the devils were still condemned to suffer. This element is most clearly shown in (XIV), which represents Lucifer laying claim to Mankind before God. Hostility to man is also shown in (XV) and (XVI), in which Lucifer, Carne and Mundo appear as witnesses against Mankind and tell of his sins. In the trial scene of (XV) Lucifer maintains that man deserves no mercy, ll. 316-25:

Se que por lo cometido
contra Dios, su padre eterno,
tiene justo merescido
muchas veces el ynfierno,
si justicia ubiese avido.

Se que aquesta es la verdad,
y que no meresce el Hombre

¹⁴ Cf. *Inferno*, XIII, 124-9:

Diretto a loro era la selva piena
Di nere cagne bramose e correnti,
Come veltri che uscisser di catena.
In quel che s'appiattò miser li denti,
E quel dilaceraro a brano a brano;
Poi sen portar quelle membra dolenti.

¹⁵ Cf. *Inferno*, XVIII, 34-6:

Di qua, di là, su per lo sasso tetro
Vidi dimon' cornuti con gran ferze
Che li battean crudelmente di retro.

aya del Dios piadad,
y lo firmo de mi nonbre
y que soy mayor de hedad.

In (II) Lucifer shows resentment and jealousy against Mankind, who he fears will take his place as ruler of the world, ll. 51-55:

En grande tristeza bivo,
viendo tan gran crudeldad!
Muy grande agravio rrecibo
que me haga Dios captivo
y de al honbre libertad.

and ll. 81-85.

Yo, por solo un pensamiento,
del cielo ynpireo fui hechado
sin aver mas miramiento;
y un honbre pobre, anbriento,
piensa rreynar en mi estado?

In (III) Lucifer rejoices at the sin of Cain, and adds, ll. 366-70:

. . . . no avra ninguno
que no me llame su rrey
por servicios a mi ley,
y quando se escape alguno
sera ver bolar un buey.

Hostility to Mankind is found throughout (XX), and especially in the challenge sent by Lucifer to Honbre, ll. 307-13 and 317-86. In (VI), ll. 16-30, Satan expresses his joy over the sins of men:

A mi gran contento no hallo su ygual.
O gozo gozoso, estraño, cunplido!
pues todas las partes donde e residido
las hallo viçiosas, y su golfo tal
que esta todo ciego, liviano, perdido.

Sus yntinçiones del todo dañadas,
usuras y logros, andar y bullir;
todos metidos en un mal bivir,
de tratos muy feos, de que mis moradas
con poco trabajo las pienso hinchir.

Y pues diligencia y astucia e tenido,
no me conviene de oy mas descansar,
mas siempre bullir, correr, trafagar,
hasta que al honbre de Dios mas querido
con desubidiençia le haga pecar.

The Devil also shows hostility to Christ, for through him man had been redeemed. Because of this enmity, he is obliged to flee before the sign of the cross. In (X) San Christobal asks Satan why he had turned aside from the road, and Satan replies, ll. 193-207:

Pues, amigo, as de saber
qu'el que vino a padecer
hizo mucho mal a mi.
Este fue Dios verdadero
que tomando carne humana
estuvo en cruz en madero
y hizo a mi su prisionero,
rrecobrando la mançana;
y quando veo la señal
de cruz do quiso morir,
mira tu mi grande mal,
que no solo me e de apartar,
mas aun tengo de huir:
y aquesta fue la razon
que deje aquel buen camino.

Not only is the hostility of the Devil directed against Christ and Mankind, but also against all those who live a holy life. In (XI) the Devil, disguised as a maiden, tries to tempt a holy bishop. In (XIII) we have a trial scene before Christ in which Angel tells of the piety of Santa Bárbara and the Devil tries to refute the account of her virtues. In (XXVI) Satanás, Mundo and Carne appear as the accusers of all righteous men.

A special function of the Devil is to carry to Hell the souls of the wicked. We learn the reason for this in one of the scenes of (IV). Lucifer is ordered by the Angel, after the death of Abel, to be the jailor of Mankind until the redemption, ll. 233-41:

Oye, infernal dragon,
Cancervero:
nuestro Dios, rey verdadero
a quien se deve servir,
te embia con mi ha dezir
que seas su carcelero,
y que tengas prisionero
so tu mano
a todo el linage humano.

In (XXIV) and (XXV) the devils act as the instrument of the Divine will, and carry to Hell the unwelcome guest at the wedding of the King's son.

The Devil often shows great pride, and does not hesitate to compare himself with his Creator. In (XIV) he proposes that Christ be the lord of the righteous, while he will remain master of the wicked, ll. 679-80:

sed vos señor de los buenos
y yo señor de los malos.

In the same play, Satan boasts of the evil which he has caused in the Church, ll. 81-90.

Quien a rrebulto ciudades
y levantado el Lutero,
sino yo, con mis maldades
encubriendo las verdades
del alto Dios verdadero?

Quien metio en Ynglaterra
esa seta luterana,
y en Flandes, Francia, y su tierra,
sino yo, por pura guerra,
y aun aca en aquesta Yspana?

In (XIX), ll. 319-21, Demonio says to Verdad:

Porque heres tan porfiada,
y no quies rreconocer
mi soberano poder?

In his struggles with the righteous the Devil is always defeated, usually through the intercession of Christ or one of the Virtues. In (XIX) Demonio threatens Verdad and finally attacks her, but is driven away by Justicia. In (XXI) Demonio tries to gain possession of Alma, who however is saved by Christ. The Devil is defeated in (XIV) and is ordered by Christ to return to Hell, ll. 886-90:

Y tu, caudillo dañado,
buelve a tu eterna prision
do seras atormentado
como malaventurado
en perpetua subjección.

In (XI) the Devil is confounded through the intercession of San Andrés.

The Devil shows bitter disappointment when his evil designs are defeated. In (VIII) Lucifer shows deep humiliation after the resurrection of Christ, ll. 1102-1106:

No a tres dias bien cumplidos,
mira quanto es mi dolor!
que tenia a mi sabor
todos quantos son naçidos
desde el grande hasta el menor.

In (XXVII), p. 387, the Devil, in despair at his failure to vanquish the Fraile, exclaims:

¡Ó triste de mi corrido!
¿Por qué, infierno, no me tragas?
Mi poder todo escarnido,
Fué á vencer, vengo vencido,
Herido de nuevas llagas.

And in the same play, p. 388, Diablo exclaims in disappointment to Mundo and Carne:

¡Ó cuán poquito valemos
Con el que es bueno y derecho!
Cuanto más le acometemos,
En más llamas nos ardemos,
Alumbrando en su provecho.

The Devil shows fear on certain occasions. In (XVI), when Lucifer appears as a witness against Mankind, he says that he would have fled had he been able to do so, ll. 569-73:

Justicia, yo soy venido
para mi dicho dezir,
y si pudiera huyr
y no fuera compelido,
procurara no venir.

In (IX) Redención tells Lucifer that Christ had redeemed Mankind, and Lucifer replies, ll. 349-52:

Mira que dezis, hermosa!
Sed criada y bien cortes,

porque no me faltan pies,
si quiero hechar a huir.

In the same play, Lucifer speaks of his fear of the cross, ll.
429-32:

Si no tuvieras la cruz,
yo te fiziera andar lista!
pero quitame la vista
esa soberana luz.

In only a few of the Spanish religious plays does the Devil appear simply as a comic character, and the comedy element results from the nature of the punishment for his misdeeds. The best example of this is found in (VIII). Lucifer enters in the form of a dragon, in despair at the redemption of Mankind. San Pedro, San Juan, Santo Tomás and San Phelipe enjoy his discomfiture and make sport of his appearance. They then play with him *el juego de hozes*, in which the apostles form a circle about Lucifer, who is obliged to play the part of the bull, and the game begins thus, ll. 1142-48:

San Pedro. A! gusano de mal nonbre,
di a publicas bozes
de do vienes, honbre.

Lucifer. De hozes.

San Pedro. Y, dinos, que pides?

Lucifer. Coçes.

Santo Tomas. Chicas, o grandes?

Lucifer. Como mandardes.

The apostles carry out his wishes with good will until Lucifer falls exhausted. This game was probably popular among children at the time, but I have not found any other reference to it. The scene is a good example of the coarse humor which served to enliven the religious plays.

The Devil character was also used to create comic scenes with the Bobo. In (VI) the Bobo enters the service of the Devil as page, and only escapes with great difficulty. In (XVIII) after the Bobo is imprisoned in the cave of Hell, he tries to warn others against the persuasive words of Culpa and Captividad. In (VII) the Bobo

engages in a wrestling match with the Devil in which the latter is defeated. The costume of the Devil, to which reference has already been made, also furnished a comic element.

It may be said in conclusion that the Devil in the Spanish religious plays differed but little from the same figure in the other literatures of Europe, but the character of the Devil was not as fully developed in the Spanish religious drama as in the French *Mystères*. Only by exception does he play a comic rôle, and the influence of this figure is limited to the religious plays, for I have not been able to find any trace of the influence of the character of the Devil upon the secular drama of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The Devil and *Gracioso* have no element in common.

Note. I wish to rectify two mistakes which occur in the first part of this article. P. 305. In No. XIV the sentence in favour of mankind was pronounced by Christ, not St. John. P. 306. The name of the Devil, Cancerolro should be Cancervero.

J. P. WICKERSHAM CRAWFORD

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

A BOCCACCIO ANALOGUE IN THE OLD FRENCH PROSE TRISTAN

OF the fourteen pages which are covered by the narrative of Tristan's ancestry in Löseth's analysis¹ of the Old French prose *Tristan*, nine are given to the story of Chelinde, including the adventures of the characters whose fates are interwoven with hers. This ancestress² of the great hero of romance was a daughter of the King of Babylon and her first husband was Sadoc, great-nephew of Joseph of Arimathea. In view of the elaboration and intrinsic interest of the story, one may fairly say that it constitutes much the most important element in the strange medley of incidents that make up the narrative in question. Now, the influence of the metrical romance, *Athis et Prophilias*,³ and of the legend of Oedipus⁴ on the adventures of Chelinde has already been recognized by different scholars, and the importation of a riddle *motif* from a certain type of fairy-tales in the case of the giant episodes is too obvious to require comment;⁵ but another influence of perhaps even greater importance appears to have escaped observation thus far and it is to this source of the first part of the prose *Tristan* that I now wish to call attention.

¹ E. Löseth, *Le roman en prose de Tristan*, Paris, 1890.

² She lived two hundred years before Tristan, see Löseth, p. 11.

³ Cp. Löseth, p. 7, note 4, and P. Rajna, *Fonti dell'Orlando Furioso*, pp. 598 ff., 2d edition, Firenze, 1900. On the date of this romance (probably the beginning of the 13th century) see L. F. W. Stael von Holstein, *Le roman d'Athis et Prophilias, étude littéraire sur ses deux versions*, pp. 112 ff., Upsala, 1909. Part I (which alone concerns us) was edited by A. Weber, Stoëfa, 1881. Prof. A. Hilka of Breslau has in preparation an edition of the whole poem.

⁴ Cp. W. Röttiger, *Der heutige Stand der Tristanforschung*, p. 27, Hamburg, 1897, and M. A. Potter's *Sohrab and Rustem*, p. 95, London, 1902. In the same place Röttiger points out some other *motifs*, common in the literature of stories, which have influenced the prose *Tristan*. G. Gröber, *Grundriss der romanischen Philologie*, II, Abt. I, p. 1007, sees the influence of the story of the Emperor Coustant (Constant) in the Sadoc episode, but the Oedipus legend, I believe, sufficiently explains the features of the narrative he refers to.

⁵ On this *motif*, so common in folk-tales, see F. J. Child's *English and Scottish Popular Ballads*, I, 10, 406, II, 506, III, 496, and, in general, the numerous examples indicated in the Index to that work under *Riddles*.

The story of Chelinde is as follows:

Chelinde, daughter of the King of Babylon, has been promised in marriage to the King of Persia. On the voyage to the kingdom of her intended husband, she is shipwrecked on the coast of England (!), all on board the ship perishing except herself. Sadoc, great-nephew of Joseph of Arimathea, finds her on the coast, conducts her to the castle of his brother Nabusardan, and a few days later has her baptized and marries her. One night Sadoc is detained in the forest, having been wounded in a boar-hunt, and Nabusardan, taking advantage of his absence, ravishes his wife. Sadoc is brought home and during the period of his convalescence, observing Chelinde weeping, he finds out the wrong which she has suffered. He accordingly slays his brother and escapes with his wife in a ship but they are overtaken by a storm. An old man on board warns the pagan crew that the storm is due to the presence in the ship of some one who has committed a crime.⁶ One of the sailors, who is familiar with the arts of sorcery denounces Sadoc as the criminal and they throw him (Sadoc) overboard. He swims, however, to a rock in the sea which is inhabited by a hermit, once a knight of the Round Table. Sadoc lives here three years, supported mainly by bread which heathen sailors leave him in passing. They will not remove him from the rock, however, because he is a Christian.

To return to Chelinde: The day after the storm she was landed in Cornwall, and there, still grieving for Sadoc, against her own wishes she was forced to marry Thanor, the pagan King of Cornwall. The King has a prophetic dream—namely, that he is killed by a lion whilst he is pursuing a leopard, which is also killed by the lion. He seeks an interpretation of the dream from a magician who was a descendant of Virgil. The magician tells him that the dream means that he is to be slain by a son of Chelinde, and that the leopard represents Sadoc, who is not really dead. Accordingly, when Chelinde gives birth to a son shortly afterwards, the King takes it out into the forest himself and exposes it to die, but Madule,

⁶ For this Jonah motif Professor G. L. Hamilton refers me to the similar passage in Thomas' *Tristan*, I, 38, ed. J. Bédier, Paris, 1902. Cp. also Bédier, *ibid.* note 1. There is a misprint, however, in his reference to R. Koehler. It should read: K. Warnke's *Lais de Marie de France*, 2d ed., pp. clff.

wife of a knight named Nicorant, follows the King secretly and saves the life of the boy. With the consent of her husband she brings him up as her own son and they give him the name of Apollo.

One day Thanor comes upon Pelyas, sovereign of the neighboring kingdom of Leonois, in a forest where the latter had lost his way, following a stag. He takes him home and that night gives him a bed in the chamber which he and his wife are occupying. It is a hot night and Thanor rises after a while and goes to the window where he converses with a chamberlain. Pelyas attacks them with his sword. Thanor, in his fright, falls out of the window into the sea. Pelyas, however, slays the chamberlain, throws him into the sea, and then gets into bed with Chelinde, who had been asleep during the fighting and now imagines that this is her husband. Before day Pelyas makes his escape to his own kingdom, taking a ring from Chelinde's finger with him. In the meanwhile, Thanor had been rescued by two fishermen, who leave him on the coast of Leonois. There two knights who recognize him as King of Cornwall shut him up in a fortress, and when Pelyas, imagining that Thanor was dead, declared war on Cornwall to get possession of Chelinde, they tell him of what had happened. Thereupon Pelyas binds them over to secrecy, being ashamed of his own ingratitude towards the man who had befriended him.

In Cornwall, the queen is now imprisoned on the charge of having been the cause of the chamberlain's death and the disappearance of the King. Palades, a brother of Thanor, consults a wise man concerning the affair and on his advice sends for Sadoc. Learning from this same wise man the true history of the matter, Sadoc accuses Pelyas before the King of Gaul, who is at this time the suzerain of both Cornwall and Leonois. In the trial by combat which follows Sadoc vanquishes Pelyas, but spares his life on condition that he will set Thanor free and stop the war.

Notwithstanding that he owes his liberty to him, Thanor is afraid of Sadoc, so the latter leaves Cornwall for Leonois. King Pelyas hears of his presence there and is anxious to show his gratitude to him for having spared his life. On his arrival in Leonois, Sadoc goes to the city of Albine and spends the night in a temple. As it happens, another man has taken refuge in the temple the same

night, after having killed his wife and her lover, whom he had discovered together. The men who come to seize the murderer get hold of Sadoc by mistake and he offers no resistance, since he thinks that Pelyas is merely avenging himself on him for the liberation of Thanor. According to the custom of the country he has to stand on a platform in the public view for three days and three nights before the date of the execution. Pelyas sees him there and would like to deliver him, but the laws of Leonois do not allow this privilege even to the King, although where there are two criminals condemned to die, he has the right to pardon one of them. When Luce, the son of Pelyas, learns of his father's distress at the approaching execution of Sadoc, he takes matters in his own hands, goes off and kills the father of the murdered man at whose instance Sadoc had been arrested, and joins the latter on the platform for criminals. Pelyas now can pardon either his own son or Sadoc, but gratitude to the man who had spared his own life carries the day over even parental affection and it is Sadoc that he pardons. Luce is taken out to the rock from which condemned criminals are thrown, but in passing through a forest on the way thither the party is attacked by a giant, who carries off Luce to his den and compels him there to marry his daughter.

Pelyas is still in love with Chelinde and eager to get possession of her, and Sadoc, who does not yet know her real identity, offers to aid him in fulfilling his desire. He succeeds in capturing her, whilst she is taking part in a hunt, and one of his men bears her off to Pelyas, who marries her forthwith. A recognition, however, now takes place between Sadoc and Chelinde and they are determined to escape from Pelyas; so Sadoc goes to the King and begs him for some recompense for his great services. Pelyas imprudently promises anything he desires. Great is his astonishment when Sadoc demands Chelinde herself, as his reward,⁷ but he is bound by his promise and surrenders her accordingly, whereupon the re-united couple fly from the land without delay. They soon fall into the hands, however, of the giant who had already captured Luce, and have to answer correctly a riddle, very much like the

⁷This incident, as Prof. G. L. Hamilton suggests to me, is, no doubt, an imitation of Thomas' *Tristan*, I, 170, ed. J. Bédier, Paris, 1902. The Irish harper thus wins Iseult. Cp. too Bédier, *ibid.*, p. 168, note 1.

famous one in Apollonius of Tyre, or be killed on the spot. But Sadoc is successful in his solution and so the giant merely carries Chelinde and himself off to his cave.

Sometime after this Pelyas encounters this same giant in the forest and they have also a riddle-match with life as the stake. Pelyas solves the riddle proposed to him by the giant, but the giant would have failed, if Sadoc had not come to his assistance. As a reward for this service, the giant sets Sadoc and Chelinde free, but keeps Pelyas captive, because, as he says, he likes such intelligent men as companions. Sadoc and Chelinde now make their way to a castle owned by an enchanter and there they remain fifteen years and more.

During the course of these years Apollo, the son of Sadoc and Chelinde, had grown up at King Thanor's Court and had distinguished himself by his bravery. One day, however, he imprudently lets Thanor know the story of his birth and the King, seeing that Nicorant and his wife had defeated his design in exposing Chelinde's infant child, kills Nicorant at the first opportunity. Apollo is under too great obligations to the King to revenge his foster-father, so he merely leaves the country. He too meets now the riddle-proposing giant and they have a match similar to those already related. Apollo answers the giant's riddle correctly, but the latter is non-plussed by Apollo's. Very naturally Pelyas refuses to aid his captor, so the giant loses his life as the stake and all parties return to the castle of King Pelyas.

Pelyas now renews the war with Thanor but is soon killed in battle, whereupon peace is declared. Quarrels between the surviving leaders break out afresh, however, and Thanor kills Sadoc and Luce, but is himself killed by Apollo, who succeeds Luce as King of Leonois. Being requested to marry by his subjects, Apollo selects the widow of King Thanor, not knowing that she is in reality his own mother.

About this time St. Augustine, the missionary, appears on the scene and reveals the true relation of Chelinde to Apollo. Chelinde denies his assertions furiously and intends to have him executed. The night before he is brought to the stake, Apollo has a dream which prefigures the terrible death which is awaiting his wife. On

the following day Chelinde makes St. Augustine mount the pyre, but the fire will not burn. Chelinde, however, is struck dead on the spot by a thunderbolt.

The impression of intricacy which the above narrative makes on the reader is due to the fact that the romance-writer, exceeding the measure of even the Elizabethan dramatists, has interwoven here at least four originally separate stories. Apollo's share in these transactions is, of course, in all essentials, taken directly from the legend of Oedipus. In so far as her fate is connected with his, Chelinde manifestly plays the role of Jocasta, and even Tiresias has his counterpart in St. Augustine. On the other hand, the episode of Sadoc's arrest by mistake, his exposure on the public platform before the proposed execution, the sacrifice which the son of Pelyas makes to save him, is derived either from *Athis et Prophilias* or from some other form of the well-known oriental story on which the most interesting part of that romance is based—only in its original form the person who pays a debt of gratitude by offering himself in the place of the condemned man is not the son of the King but the King himself, who, it may be remarked, is a lover of the wife of the condemned man, just as Pelyas here is a lover of Chelinde. The giant who proposes the riddles with life as the stake is so well known in fairy tales that we need not linger over his share in the narrative. Now, if we deduct these elements from the story of Chelinde, everything else in it can be derived from the source which is the especial subject of this paper—the story, namely, which forms the basis of the Seventh Novel of the Second Day of Boccaccio's *Decameron*.⁸ This story may be outlined as follows:

The Sultan of Babylon has been aided in a war by the King of Garbo (Algarve) and in gratitude gives him in marriage his beautiful daughter, Alatiel. He sends her to her intended husband with a large retinue by sea, but she is shipwrecked on the island of Majolica and here on the sea-coast she is found by a nobleman with only a few of her attendant women still alive. This nobleman, Pericon da Visalgo, takes her home and soon falls in love with her, although he is unable to communicate with her, owing to the difference of their languages. For a time she repels all of his

⁸ See *Opere Volgari di Giovanni Boccaccio*, I, 181 ff. (17 vols., Firenze, 1827-34).

advances, but he prepares a feast and having got her under the influence of wine achieves his desire. After this they live together for some time. Pericon has a brother, however, named Marato, who also falls in love with Alatiel and determines to get possession of her. So one night he slays Pericon and carries off the princess on a ship. At first she laments this change in her fortunes bitterly, but finally becomes reconciled to it. Two of the officers of the ship, however, succumb to the influence of her beauty and agree to despatch Marato, which they accomplish by shoving him overboard one day as he stands looking out to sea, unsuspecting of danger. The murderers now fall out over their prize and one of them kills the other, being at the same time severely wounded himself. He lands, however, safely at Chiarenza in the Morea and takes Alatiel with him to an inn in the city. The news of her extraordinary beauty comes to the ears of the prince of the Morea and he takes possession of her and lives with her as his wife. A friend and relative, however, of the prince of Morea—namely the Duke of Athens—hears of his cousin's good fortune and comes to see the wonderful princess. He too falls desperately in love with her, like everyone else, and plans to murder his relative and carry off Alatiel. Accordingly, he engages the assistance of the prince's chamberlain and is hidden along with a companion in his cousin's bedchamber one night. The night being hot, the prince rises and goes to the window overlooking the sea, to get the breeze. The Duke comes upon him unobserved, runs his sword through him and throws his body out of the window, where it remains undiscovered for several days among some ruined houses on the seashore below. At the same time, his companion, carries out the part in the plot assigned him and treacherously slays the chamberlain, so as to remove the only witness of the murder besides his master and himself. Alatiel has slept through the whole affair, so that when the Duke gets into bed with her, she thinks that it is her husband. Before morning, however, he takes her off to his own country, establishing her in a villa on the sea, some distance from Athens. Having already a wife, he is afraid to bring Alatiel to the capital itself. Later on a brother of this wife falls in love with the fair stranger and, under pretext of revenging the wrong done his sister, seizes her and

carries her away. Even after this still other adventures await the heroine of the tale and altogether she passes through the hands of nine men before she is finally restored to her father. The resemblance of the story of Chelinde however, ceases with the episode of the Duke of Athens. At this point in the prose *Tristan* the influence of *Athis et Prophilias*⁹ sets in. Suffice it to say, that on the advice of an old retainer of the family, Alatiel in Boccaccio's tale conceals from her father the extraordinary series of adventures of which she has been the victim and relates, instead, that the four years of her absence she had spent in a nunnery. She is now again sent to the King of Garbo but with better success, and he receives her as his bride without the least suspicion that he is not her first lover. The cynical humor of this conclusion, which has nothing corresponding to it in the *Tristan* episode, would seem to stamp it as the invention of Boccaccio.

Despite differences¹⁰ between the two stories which are too obvious to need pointing out, the truth of the assertion which I made above is, I believe, sufficiently manifest. Take away the elements derived from *Athis et Prophilias*, the legend of Oedipus and the riddle-proposing giant of the fairy-tales¹¹ and we have as the basis of the episode of the prose *Tristan* substantially the tale of the *Decameron*. Let us enumerate the points which the two stories have in common:

A pagan princess, the daughter of the ruler of Babylon, is betrothed to another pagan monarch and is sent to him by sea. She is shipwrecked, however, on an island before she reaches her destination. She is found in an exhausted condition on the sea-coast by a nobleman who takes her home to a castle and lives with her as his wife. (In the *Tristan*, the castle is his own; in Boccaccio it is his brother's.) Here the finder's brother falls in love with her and there is a fatal conflict between them over her. (In the *Tristan* the brother is slain, in Boccaccio, the finder.) The survivor flies with

⁹ Boccaccio has himself elsewhere used the *Athis et Prophilias*—in *Decameron*, X, 8. Cp. Pio Rajna, *Fonti dell' Orlando Furioso*, p. 601, 2d ed., Firenze, 1900.

¹⁰ The influence of the *Estoire del Saint Graal* (to which we have allusions in the first paragraphs of the prose *Tristan*) may be responsible for Sadoc's life on the rock. Cp. H. O. Sommer's edition of that romance, p 89. Washington, 1909.

her by sea, but members of the crew (for different reasons in the two stories) throw him overboard. (In the *Tristan* he swims to safety, in Boccaccio he is drowned.) When she comes to land, she is forced to marry the ruler of the country in which she lands. A friend of this ruler, however, determines to get possession of her, and to do so, carries into execution a plot, which is identical in the two stories in almost every detail. The only differences are: first, that the chamberlain, although in both versions, he loses his life as a consequence of the plot, does not conspire against his master in the *Tristan*; secondly, that in the *Tristan* the victim of the plot is not killed, when precipitated from the window. After this episode, as has already been remarked, Boccaccio and the *Tristan* diverge. What, now, are the relations of Boccaccio and the Old French romance with respect to this story? If there is any borrowing in the case, Boccaccio, of course, must be the borrower, for the *Tristan* is a work of the thirteenth century¹¹ and the life of the great Italian fell wholly in the fourteenth century. I will say at once that I do not believe that Boccaccio derived his tale from the prose *Tristan*. It seems incredible that he should have selected from the long narrative of Chelinde's adventure in that romance just these incidents as the basis of a separate tale. On the other hand, there can be no reasonable doubt that the author of the prose *Tristan* derived the incidents we are considering, as he has everything else in the episode, from some earlier source. If this is so, the two writers evidently drew from a common source, which, as far as I am aware, is no longer in existence. Indeed, this *Tristan* episode is the only close analogue to Boccaccio's masterpiece which has yet been pointed out.¹² The story of Antheia in the *Ephesiaca*¹³ of the Greek

¹¹ E. Löseth, p. xxiv, puts it between 1215 and 1230. Boccaccio lived 1313-1375.

¹² For the literature relating to the sources of this tale see A. C. Lee, *The Decameron, its sources and analogues*, pp. 36-8, London, 1909. The opinion of Lami there cited, that Boccaccio's tale was based on incidents that actually occurred between 1315 and 1320 is, of course, untenable in view of the connection between this tale and the prose *Tristan*—a thirteenth century work. E. Du Méril, *Histoire de la Poésie Scandinave*, p. 346, note 1, Paris, 1839, follows Lami.

I may add that I have followed up all the clues furnished by Lee's references, but none of the stories he cites, as it seems to me, resembles Boccaccio's except in a very general way.

¹³ See the edition in *Erotici Scriptores*, pp. 183 ff., Paris, 1856.

novelist, Xenophon, which was once regarded as constituting Boccaccio's source for this tale—so even by Landau¹⁴—bears really only a very general resemblance to that of Alatiel. The individual adventures are different, and, besides, the heroine of the Greek romance preserves her chastity throughout. What I have said of the *Ephesiaca* applies also to the other analogues, that have been suggested.¹⁵

With the materials at hand, it is, perhaps, impossible to reconstruct the original story. It is safe to say, however, that the sensuality and cynical humour which characterize the tale in the *Decameron* were introduced by Boccaccio and the number of lovers through whose hands the heroine passes—nine in all—is probably due (although this is not certain) to these qualities of the Italian author. In the *Tristan* the number is five, but in the cases of Sadoc, Thanor and Pelyas there are two periods of cohabitation each, so that by the substitution of entirely new characters it would be easy to make the number eight. In the later incidents, in regard to which the two stories are different, Boccaccio is more likely to be nearer the original, since, as we have seen, the influence of *Athis et Prophilias* here begins to affect the narrative in the prose *Tristan*. He may well have invented, however, some of these later incidents. The same uncertainty must hang over any discussion as to which of the two versions represents the original story most correctly in the divergences which they exhibit with respect to that part of the narrative where in the main they agree. For instance, the part played by the philosophers or astrologers in the prose *Tristan* may

¹⁴ Cp. Marcus Landau, *Die Quellen des Dekameron*, p. 296, 2d ed., Stuttgart, 1884. Some earlier scholars, however, had already rejected this view; see Lee, p. 37.

¹⁵ See Lee, loc. cit. Most of the stories cited by Lee are hardly parallel at all, e. g., that of *L'abbesse qui fut grosse*—which, besides, as Prof. G. L. Hamilton justly observes, is not a *fabliau* but a *miracle de Notre Dame*. For literature of this particular story see Toldo in Herrig's *Archiv*, vol. 118, pp. 74 ff. I have no doubt that the common source which I have assumed above for Boccaccio and the *Tristan* episode was of oriental origin. In both the heroine is oriental and the story starts from the East. The author of the *Tristan* brings this heroine to England, obviously to connect her with the story of Tristan. In Boccaccio the action is kept in the East (including the eastern Mediterranean). Moreover the stories cited by Lee which show similar *motifs* to Boccaccio (none of them, to be sure, very close) are all oriental.

have belonged to the original story and have been rejected by Boccaccio in accordance with his customary rationalistic spirit, or, on the other hand, this feature of the *Tristan* may have been due to the influence of innumerable similar incidents in mediaeval stories.¹⁶ To say that it reads as if it were original is merely to state a subjective impression, which has nothing of the nature of proof. In view of the uncertainties of the problem, I think it best not to pursue this line of discussion any further.

J. DOUGLAS BRUCE

UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE

¹⁶ It is worthy of notice, perhaps, that in the prose *Tristan* no use is made of the ring which Pelyas drew from Chelinde's finger (p. 6). It would seem that this ought to have played a part subsequently in some recognition scene. Have we here a detail which was so used in the original story? Professor G. L. Hamilton has called my attention to the *Conte del Graal*, ll. 530 ff. (where Perceval's mother, among other things that a knight should do, bids her son always take a ring from a lady, if he can) as proof that this detail need not involve a subsequent recognition scene. He is probably right, although the situation implied there is hardly parallel to the one in our text. On the other hand, in certain works containing passages that show a close resemblance to the incident in our romance, the ring obtained under these circumstances does lead up to recognition scenes. So in Terence's *Hecyra* (cp. ll. 839 ff.), Pamphilus, after violating Philumena in the dark, takes a ring from her which serves in the end to bring about a recognition. Similarly the jewels in Boccaccio's *Decameron*, III, 9, and its derivatives. Cp. Lee's notes, pp. 101 ff., to this tale. See also the newly discovered fragments of Menander's *Epitrepontes*, ll. 657 ff.—*Four Plays of Menander*, p. 126, ed. Edward Capps, Boston, 1910—and the story of Heracles and Auge, cited by Capps, p. 126, note. In these last cases, the hero leaves a ring with the woman.

BARTHELEMY ANEAU: A STUDY IN HUMANISM

(Continued from page 289)

VI

ALTHOUGH engaged in much literary work at this time, Aneau did not neglect his teaching. From the time that he assumed the chair of principal, Fortune seemed to smile upon the Collège de la Trinité. The Consulate took greater interest in its welfare, and granted without hesitation the requests made by the beloved principal. But unfortunately, success has even its disadvantages; and amongst those that beset this institution is one that demands our attention for a moment.

The reputation of Lyons as the city of enlightenment, the great book-centre of Europe, the home of the most progressive and learned of scholars, had made of it the Mecca of all those of more or less pronounced liberal views. And with their arrival, there arose in profusion private schools in which oftentimes heterodox doctrines were taught. It is true that many of these institutions already existed in Lyons at the time when the Collège de la Trinité was founded: in fact one of its principals, Claude de Cublize, was called from the Ecole de la Bombarde: but with the accession of Aneau their number rapidly increased. The persecuted humanists felt without doubt that a city which would protect a man, known to possess liberal ideas, in the face of a most conservative and inflexible clergy—that such a city would afford them perhaps a shelter from the storm that was impending. But their presence unfortunately menaced the interests of the college: their teachings were certainly not in harmony with the firmly established tenets of the Catholic faith; and the more austere dignitaries of the church hastened to take advantage of this opportunity to emphasize the peril to which the city was exposed by not placing the college under their immediate supervision. All of which tended to cloy Aneau with the radical doctrines emanating from Geneva.¹

¹ A former professor of the Collège de la Trinité, Jean Pelisson, who was at this time principal of the Collège de Tournon, complained bitterly of these

Furthermore, the Collège de la Trinité, unlike the Collège de Tournon—which was endowed by the Cardinal de Tournon mainly for the instruction of scions of noble families—was dependent, to a large extent, upon the support of the general public, inasmuch as many, if not the majority, of its students were from the poorer classes. If then a part of this support were not forthcoming, these pupils would be the first to suffer, and the main purpose of the founders of the college would be defeated. We can therefore understand why the Echevins of Lyons were so anxious to suppress these mushroom institutions. So on the 22nd of March, 1540/1, at the request no doubt of the authorities of the Collège de la Trinité, the following resolution was passed by the Consulate:

“Pource que plusieurs petites escolles se mectent sus parmy ceste ville pour les jeunes enfans au détriment du colliege nouvellement érigé en ceste ville, grant et manifique, qui a esté grans deniers à bastir, il a esté mys en termes de obtenir lectres pour abolir lesd. petites escolles, mais par faulte de nombre n'y a esté autrement ordonné.”²

In 1540, after Aneau had submitted his formulary, the Consulate granted him, according to the established custom, a lease of the college for three years. But before it expired in June, 1543, it was renewed, this time for six years with an annual salary of one hundred *livres*. The Echevins were aware that they had finally secured a man especially fitted for this position, one who commanded the love and respect of his students and who was learned enough to exert a marked influence upon his fellow citizens. Accordingly in 1544, we find that the city authorities paid to

“Mre Barthelemy Aneau, principal régent du colliege de la Trinité dudit Lyon, la somme de cent livres tourn., à luy ordonnée par led. consulat durant six années, commandant au jour Saint Jehan Bapte. mil Vc XLIII, desquelles six années ceste est la IIe gens pestilentieux. “Pires encore,” he writes, “estoient les pédagogues qui, de tous costés, venoient se loger à Tournon, pour le grand bruit du collège, comme envoyés de Genève, et qui avoient tant fait par leurs simulations et dissimulations sataniques, qu'ils avoient gagné des plus grosses et des plus riches maisons en tous estats de ces pays, et en emmenoient les enfants d'icelles audit Tournon pour être enseignés audit collège.” Cf. my article on *Jean Pelisson de Condrieu* in the *Revue de la Renaissance*, 1910, pp. 113-125.

² *Archives communales de Lyon, Actes Consulaires*, BB 58, fo. 148 vo.

payée, affin que led. principal se puisse mieulx entretenir et donner bonne instruction et enseignement aux enfans estans aud. collège."³

This may appear to be a remarkably small salary for a man of the reputation of Aneau, but when we remember that the tuition exacted from each student amounted to *deux sols six deniers* a month, or that a round trip from Lyons to Mâcon cost less than a franc,⁴ we can readily see how great was the purchasing power of money at that period. In addition to his salary, Aneau had at his disposal the tuition paid by the students; and as it is reasonable to suppose that the attendance at the Collège de la Trinité was not inferior to that of the sister institution at Tournon (*i. e.*, from 1200 to 1600 pupils), his total income was indeed quite comfortable.⁵ But out of this, of course, he had to pay his regents: it was partly through them that the college acquired its reputation which attracted so many students. Realizing that the more scholarly the regent, the more he would add to the fame of the institution, Aneau sought the best men he could possibly obtain. We can

³ *Ibid.*, CC 956, fo. 89, "Compte des deniers communys, 1544." On the 3rd of July, 1544, this act was ratified: "Passé mandement à maistre Barthélémy Agneau, principal du collège de la Trinité, de la somme de cent livres tournois à lui ordonnée par forme d'avance pour faire ses provisions pour l'entretenement dudit collège sur ses gaiges ordinaires de cent livres tournois à lui accordez pour sa retenue et bail dudit collège, et pour ceste présente année qui sfinira à la feste Saint Jehan Baptiste mil cinq cens quarante cinq." *Actes consulaires*, BB 61, fo. 342. The order for the payment of this sum in 1545 is thus conceived: "A mre. Barthélémy Aneau, recteur et principal du collège de la Trinité érigé nouvellement en lad. ville, la somme de cent livres tournois à lui ordonnée par forme d'avance pour ses gaiges ordinaires de semblable somme qui lui furent accordez à sa retenue lors qu'il fut mys principal et se chargea dudit collège, et ce pour la troiziesme année qui sfinira à la feste St. Jehan Baptiste prouchain venant. Et laquelle advance lui a esté faite par cy devant pour faire les provisions nécessaires pour l'entretenement dud. collège." *Ibid.*, CC 963, 1545.

⁴ Demogeot says that (in 1540) 13 *sous 2 deniers* were equivalent to 41 *livres de pain blanc*. In 1838 that amount of bread was worth 7 francs. Cf. *Lyon Ancien et Moderne*, Lyons, 1838, p. 412. Du Verger and Canappe, two former principals of this college, received 40 and 60 francs a year respectively. Cf. my article on the *Collège de la Trinité*, *Revue de la Renaissance*, 1909, pp. 140, 149, etc. Jean Pelisson was paid a salary of *deux cens livres tournois* a year to act as principal of the Collège de Tournon, but apparently had no right to the tuition. Cf. my article on *Jean Pelisson*, *ibid.*, 1910.

⁵ The Consulate reserved also quarters in the college buildings for the principal and his regents, so that they would have no rent to pay.

easily understand then why he was able to keep in the Collège de la Trinité such capable men as the poets Charles Fontaine and Christofle Milieu, and the well-known Scotch humanist Florent Wilson (latinised as *Volusenus*), who were his regents at this time.⁶

We have already noted that, in the formulary of 1540, Aneau made provision for a *dispenseur ou proviseur* and a cook who were to attend to the nourishment of the pupils of the college. Not realizing perhaps that there would be any important increase in the number of *pensionnaires*, or boarding-pupils, he made no mention of where or how the bread was to be obtained. He was depending without doubt upon the *four banal ou communal*, where the inhabitants of the section of the city in which it was located were accustomed to secure their bread. But he soon found that along with the larger enrolment of *pensionnaires*, there was a great increase in the number of *martinets*, or day-pupils, who took at least one meal a day in the refectory of the college.⁷ It was obviously difficult for the *four banal* to satisfy this sudden influx of keen appetites; and therefore Aneau was forced to make a complaint to the Consulate. In order to relieve this unfortunate state of affairs, the Echevins ordered, on the 13th of September, 1544, "faire un four au collège de la Trinité pour cuyre le pain dudit collège et non pour autres."⁸ At the same time they thought it opportune, in accordance with the request of the principal, to make all necessary repairs on the college buildings. Early in 1545, this work was completed, and the Consulate paid to

" Mathieu Penet, dict Michelet, maçon, la somme de cinquante neuf livres tourn . . . tant pour ung fourt par luy faict au collège de la Trinité pour cuyre le pain nécessaire pour la nourriture du Mre. régent et pensionnaires dud. collège . . . que pour certaines autres reparations faictes en icelluy collège pour l'utilité d'icelluy."⁹

The Echevins, however, were not the only ones interested in the

*For Charles Fontaine, cf. the scholarly dissertation of Dr. R. L. Hawkins of Harvard University, in the Harvard library. I shall treat Milieu and Wilson in another place.

⁷According to Demogeot (*op. cit.*, p. 411) the college was only an *externat* at first, but after 1536, the number of classes was increased and buildings were constructed for the *demeurance des commensaux*.

⁸Arch. Com. BB 63, fo. 85.

⁹Ibid., CC 963.

success of the college. The Confrérie de la Trinité had watched its growth and development with much solicitude ever since it was deeded to the city in 1527. Numerous largesses were made by this benevolent society to the city institution for the benefit of the children of the indigent *confrères*. Among the most important of these gifts was the one of 60 *livres* made in the year 1544, which was continued for three years. This was but another indication of the esteem in which Aneau was held by his fellow citizens. According to this interesting document, which deserves to be quoted in full, in

“L'an mil cinq cens quarante quatre, estans corriers les sires Phelipes Seneton, Arnault Arconsy, Adam Rauel, Guillaume Regnault, Pierre Maistre, Pierre Seue, et Christofle Rauasse, sur la requeste faicte par plusieurs paouures confrères de la Saincte Trinité, et auoir ouy l'aduis de plusieurs notables confrères de lad. confrarie, fut ordonné que des deniers de ladicte confrarie seroit baillé à Maistre Barthelemy Aneau, recteur du colliege de la Trinité, la somme de soixante liures tourn. pour enseigner aux lectres les paouures enfans des paouures confrères d'icelle confrarie qui n'ont de quoy paier le maistre. Lesquelz paouures enfans seront enuoyez par messieurs les corriers de lad. confrarie qui se enquerront diligemment; et desquelz paouures enfans sera par ledict recteur faict vng rolle affin de les recognoistre quant besoing sera. Et pour l'année commandée à la feste de la Trinité, mil cinq cens quarante quatre, et finissant à la feste de la Saincte Trinité de l'an mil cinq cens quarante cinq, fut ordonné qu'il seroit auancé audict recteur, la somme de soixante liures tourn., et a esté continué le paiement de ladicte somme par trois ans, et jusques l'on cogneust que pour raison de ladicte somme n'estoit faict aucune gratuité aux enfans desdictz paouures confrères.”¹⁰

It was during this same year (1544), that Christofle Milieu (*Mylaeus*), one of the professors of the Collège de la Trinité, was preparing his well-known commentary on the origins of the city of Lyons, which consists mainly of citations from various classical and other historians.¹¹ Realizing that his work would have greater

¹⁰ *Registre de la confrérie de la Sainte-Trinité*, fo. 46, *Bibl. de Lyon*, ms. 355 (3056). For Seneton, cf. my article on the *Collège de la Trinité*, *Revue de la Renaissance*, 1909, p. 148. Pierre Seue is, without doubt, the *échevin* of that year. Cf. my article on the *Family of Maurice Scève*, *Mod. Lang. Publications*, 1909, p. 474. For the above document, cf. also Guigue, *Le Livre des Confrères de la Trinité*, Lyons, 1898, p. 54.

¹¹ *De Primordiis claris-simae vr-bis/Lvgduni/Commen-/tari-/vs./ . . . Lvgduni apud Seb./Gryphium,/M. D. XLV./4to., 39 pp., Bibl. nat. L7k4325. In*

chance of meeting with the favor of the public if the name of a prominent scholar were connected with it, Milieu requested Aneau to prepare the dedicatory verses which would show that he gave it his approval. Yielding to the author's request Aneau composed the following quatrain which is addressed to the city of Lyons (verso of title-page) :

En tibi imago tui, Lugdunum, *γνῶθι σεαυτὸν*
Quale olim fueris, quale sies hodie.
Olim doctrinae praestantis alumna: uideto
Ne sit ab antiquo degenerare pudor.

Early in the following year (1545), the kind-hearted principal, ever solicitous of the comfort of his pupils, made a petition to the Consulate, which was granted forthwith. The stone pavements of the class-rooms afforded great discomfort, especially to the little children, during the winter. Accordingly, Aneau requested the Echevins to have them covered with wood (*i. e.*, *poster* or *plancheier*) ; and, on the fifteenth of January, 1544/5, it was resolved by the Consulate that

“des depositz et boys apartenant à ladicte ville et qui sont restées (*sic*) des boulevars et autres bastimens, l'on fera poster les classes du colliege de la Trinité qui sont pavées de pierres et rendent grand froydeur aux petis enfans.”¹²

But before the end of January, 1545, the plague began to ravage the city. It was therefore absolutely necessary to close the doors of the college. So on the 27th of February, an order to that effect was passed by the Consulate, “pour le regard des martinets qui vont et reviennent audit collège; et quant aux pensionnaires, on les tiendra serrés aud. collège jusqu'à la feste de Pâques, et jusqu'à nouvel ordre.”¹³

this copy, the following note, written in an eighteenth century hand, is attached to one of the pages: “Le 7e 7bre. 1761 j'ay prêté à Mr. Tolozan avocat du Roy pour huit jours, les deux pièces suivantes: 1^o, le Traité fait par les échevins de Lyon avec Barthel. Aneau, de Bourges, pour le Collège de la Trinité, 1558; 2^o, le contrat de fondation dud. collège par Mrs. les coners. et échevins de Lyon au profit des PP. jésuites du 14e. 7bre. 1567. On me les a rendus, et ils sont dans une liasse avec d'autres papiers concernant le collège. Ce 9e. Xbre. 1763.”

¹² *Actes consulaires*, BB 63, fo. 111.

¹³ *Ibid.* Cf. also Périaud, *Notes et Documents*, Lyons, 1838. According to Ducange, a martinet is an *écolier vagabond*, that is, an *externe*.

This untoward event, it seems, had a rather depressing effect upon the college. Many of its pupils were diverted to the Collège de Tournon and other neighboring institutions. And from this time on, it appears that Aneau was more and more dissatisfied with his position. His petitions to the Consulate for assistance now become more numerous. The upshot of it all was his resignation, which, as we shall see, was due principally to lack of funds to run the college satisfactorily. But before undertaking the subsequent history of the institution, let us return for a moment to consider the literary work accomplished by Aneau up to this time.

VII

It is only in recent years that we have begun to understand the real purport of the Renaissance in France. Formerly many of the most vital problems which taxed the ingenuity of the humanists were almost entirely overlooked. Ideas which were once supposed to be the essential product of this great movement are now known to have either antedated its inception or to have occupied a place of secondary importance. Thus it was believed for years that Ronsard and Du Bellay were the first to reveal "la belle antiquité" to the educated inhabitants of France. "Quant à la littérature latine," says M. V. Le Clerc, "peu s'en fallait qu'on ne l'eût déjà au XIV^e siècle, telle que nous l'avons aujourd'hui. Ce mot trop légèrement employé de renaissance des lettres ne saurait s'appliquer aux lettres latines: elles n'ont pas ressuscité parce qu'elles n'étaient point mortes."¹⁴ We know that the rhetorical school of poetry, which flourished toward the close of the Fifteenth Century, was well acquainted with all the Latin authors of the Golden Age. What the Renaissance taught literary France was a greater appreciation of the masterpieces of Latin literature.

Furthermore, it was also maintained that the main purpose of literary criticism during the Renaissance was the justification of poetry. Nevertheless the attitude of the *Grands Rhétoriqueurs*, for example, differed *au fond* but slightly from that of the *Pléiade* and

¹⁴ *Histoire litt. de la France*, XXIV, p. 326. For a study of the rôle of Latin literature during the reign of Charles VI, cf. A. Thomas, *De Joannis de Monstrolio vita et operibus*.

its followers. Jean Bouchet, a leading member of the rhetorical school, wrote as early as 1516 in his *Temple de bonne renomée* (ff. XLVIII vo. and XLIX ro.) that under the art of poetry,

"qui est de tres hault priz
Plusieurs saouirs y sont souuent compriz
Cest assauoir science historialle
La naturelle et aussi la moralle
Philosophie et l'entropologie
Geographie, et la philologie. . . ."

For Bouchet, says M. Hamon, "la poésie approche du divin; le travail du poète ressemble au travail de Dieu, lequel a *tout fait par compas*."¹⁵ According to this *rhétoriqueur*, the poet should have, in addition to moral and other qualities, an almost universal knowledge. In solitude alone can he enter into communion with the muses. That such a man holds the highest place in the esteem of all worthy people is obvious from the fact that those who speak ill of him, "sont ignorants, ignares et menteurs."¹⁶

How closely this conception of the poet—though not so nobly expressed—approaches that of Ronsard! And yet Bouchet was not alone in holding to this ideal of poetry: his colleagues as well as his predecessors expounded the same doctrine.

In this as well as in many other respects, the *Pléiade* merely restated, in a more concise and forcible manner, ideas which, as Aneau points out in the *Quintil Horatian*, were already trite to many. A careful examination of its numerous phases shows that the Renaissance was after all a quite natural evolution that was slowly taking place. In the same manner Rousseau postulates doctrines that were advanced a half-century earlier by the Abbé de Saint-Pierre and his contemporaries.

If then the Renaissance does not represent, as we were formerly inclined to believe, a violent literary revolution, what, we may ask, was being added to the general development of culture at the time when Aneau was beginning to acquire a reputation as a *littérateur*—in other words, during the years immediately preceding the publication of the *Deffence et Illustration* of Du Bellay? We have already

¹⁵ *Un Grand Rhétoriqueur Poitevin, Jean Bouchet, par A. Hamon, Paris, 1901, p. 214.*

¹⁶ *Temple de bonne renomée, fo. XLIX ro.*

called attention to the importance attached by the younger generation to a more extensive use of the mother tongue.¹⁷ Some ten years or more before the appearance of the Du Bellay's famous manifesto, a strong patriotic feeling for the national language was extending throughout the whole country. Such a movement would naturally attract the attention of a schoolmaster ever anxious to please his patrons, upon whom he was dependent to a great extent for his existence. But Aneau was in addition farsighted enough to realize that French would inevitably replace Latin in literature as well as in fields of erudition. So he was quick to take advantage of the opportunity afforded him, and sought at once to stimulate the use of French amongst the pupils of the city institution, which was naturally far more in touch with actual life than any religious school could possibly be. But to attain this end, it was necessary to have text-books in French; and as they were all written in Latin, translations would have to be made. In his formulary, Aneau stated that *bon lionnois* was preferable to *mauvays et barbare latin*, and he realized also without doubt that the pupil could more easily and accurately acquire Latin after he had thoroughly mastered his native tongue.

But in the accomplishment of this task, Aneau was aware that he would expose himself to severe criticism. On the one hand, the pedants and scholiasts insisted upon a line of demarcation between themselves and the uninitiated, and would ridicule any effort to place the classics within the reach of the general public. On the other, the dignitaries of the church, fearing a decrease in the number of students in the clerical institutions as a result of such a movement—which might also entail a decline in benefits—viewed with suspicion the productions of these unselfish humanists.

Furthermore, it was not an easy matter to secure capable men willing to sacrifice themselves in an undertaking so greatly disdained. No one cared to lay himself open to the accusation of being unable to write Latin—an unpardonable sin in the eyes of the schoolmen. Even the bellicose Peletier du Mans was finally forced to yield to criticism and write his mathematical works in Latin. So the only way open was for Aneau to do the work himself; and he

¹⁷ Cf. the formulary of Aneau, ROMANIC REVIEW, p. 203.

was willing to weather the storm. He became thereby one of the pioneers in this field, in which he was excelled by few, if any, of his contemporaries. And this method of instruction proved so successful that in 1558, Jean François de Gabiano, a Lyonnese printer, proudly stated in the preface of a small French-Latin dictionary that "avons imprimé cetuy petit dictionnaire des mots françois tournez en latin à la requeste de Maistre Barthelemy Aneau."¹⁸

In the selection of texts for translation, Aneau was guided by the value of the moral or political ideas which they contained. He preferred, of course, the classical authors, but, when necessary, he did not hesitate to turn to the great Latinists of contemporary date—to Erasmus, Thomas Morus, Alciat, Gesner, and others, who treated questions more in sympathy with the spirit of the times. Aneau's aim in education was to develop intelligent, moral men who would devote themselves to the uplifting of humanity; and few more beautiful examples could be found than those just mentioned.

While accomplishing his task, Aneau had to overcome a great difficulty—that of rendering the carefully polished Latin phrase in the rough and unstable French of the early sixteenth century. He realized that any attempt to rival the prose of the original was utterly impossible. At first, his aim was very modest: he sought merely to make a careful literal translation. To justify such a rendition, he states, in a prefatory quatrain in the *Comedie ou Dialogue matrimonial*, that though Horace does not require it, he does not forbid it either:

En translatant, mot pour mot rendre, Horace
N'oblige point, ne le deffend aussi.
Qui le peut faire: en a il moins de grace?
Si c'est mal fait, mal tourné suys ainsi (fo. Aii, ro.).

But a year later in the translation of the epistle of Cicero to Augustus, his intention is to make a freer version in a simple easy prose, exempt as far as possible from the over-ornamentation and verbosity to which translators, especially of verse, were then addicted. In a prefatory note to Mellin de Saint-Gelais (Dii, ro.), he writes as follows:

¹⁸ Baudrier, *Bibliographie lyonnaise*, VII, p. 198.

"Si d'aduenture quelque fois ceste epistre venoit en vos mains, vous plais la receuoir à l'interinement de sa preuve, ou condamnation, comme son iuge: vous, qui en Eloquence et Poesie Francoise tant de vos predecesseurs hereditaire que nayue de vous mesme, entre les excellens de nostre temps heureux estes tres excellent. En laquelle tournant, j'ay fuy longs enuironnements (dicts periphrases) braues affectations, escorcheries, et mots enflez, et ay suuyu (sans eloigner la diction Rommaine) purité et propriété de la Francoise, et principalement le droit fil de parolle, selon l'ordre de nature: lequel la langue Latine mesme et entrelasse pour la collocation de ses membres, et la Francoise le suyct: et en est plus belle, plus naturelle, et plus aisée à estre entendue."

How clearly he foresees the possibilities of French prose! Is it astonishing that he was vexed at the pretentious phrases of Du Bellay, who, with the ardor of youth, claimed for the *Pléiade* the *Deffence et Illustration de la Langue Francoise*? In the *Quintil Horatian*, Aneau wished to administer a rebuke to the ambitious young poets by showing that the way, in this field as well as in poetry, had already been blazed years before by modest and unassuming scolars.

Understanding Aneau's purpose in making these translations, it is well for us to examine more closely his works in order to see whether he was successful in the accomplishment of his task.

VIII

The first of these two translations is the *Comédie ou dialogue matrimonial*,¹⁹ which was intended to serve as an *exemplaire de paix en mariage*. The original work was by Erasmus—the *Uxor Memphigamos*, of which Aneau's rendition into French is *La femme mary plaignant*. The dedicatory preface is addressed to a well-

¹⁹ *Comedie ou Dia-/logue matrimonial,/Exemplaire de Paix en Ma-/riage, extract du deuis d'Erasme, trās/laté de Latin en Francoys: duquel/est le tiltre,/Uxor Memphigamos,/C'est à dire:/La femme mary plaignant./ . . . /1541./ On les uend au Pallais, en la gallerie par ou/on ua à la Chancellerie, es boutiques de Iehā/Longis, et Vincent Certenas libraires./ 8 vo. of 28 unnumbered leaves, italics, signed A-C by iiiii, D by iii, Bibl. nat., Rés. Yf 4354. Du Verdier I, 259; Catalogue Soleinne, I, no. 378; Brunet, II, 1041. It seems that this work was published simultaneously by Denys Janot, Paris, 1541, 8vo. of 28 unnumbered leaves, 22 lines to the page, signed A-C by 8, D by 4. According to M. Emile Picot, there was a copy of this edition in the library of M. le comte de Legnerolles, but I have not seen it.*

known lawyer at Chalon-sur-Saône, Guillaume du Martheray, "à la requeste duquel fut tourné en françois." "Petit livret," says the poet to his work,

"Petit liuret, asses rude tourné,
 Tourne tes uers, uers Chalon fais un tour,
 Tour ne scay plus, pour mieulx estre atourné,
 Tourné, poly, à la plane, ou au tour
 Autour de cil tien toy donq' (sans retour)
 Qui te requist: et pour qui es en uoye
 Si luy diras, l'Aneau tout rond m'enuoie
 Par deuers uous (monsieur de Martheray)
 Prian que l'oeil de uostre esprit m'enuoie,
 Si ie uous plait, à uous m'arresteray (fo. Aii, ro.)."

The numerous rhyming tricks with which these verses are strewn do not necessarily signify that the author is still an adherent of the school of Crétin. They should not be taken too seriously. Aneau is merely trying to secure the approbation of this distinguished lawyer, and has therefore adopted the usual form of the clever compliment, such as a Marot or a Mellin de Saint-Gelais would be inclined to write.

But when we turn to the *Prémonition au lecteur*, we find ourselves at once in the presence of the teacher and moralist. Aneau doubtless selected this work because he felt that it would benefit not only his pupils but especially their parents to whom he was so grateful for repeated favors. He states first that this dialogue "est faict à la doctrine tant des hommes, que des femmes ioinctz par le sacrement de mariage," for in such an interlocution "sont distinctement et abondamment escriptes les choses, lesquelles conuient l'une et l'autre partie cognoistre et souffrir, par mutuel amour et alterne patience pourtant (selon la parole Apostolique) la charge l'un de l'autre, duquel estat de mariage n'est nul plus beau ne plus saint." But we can only attain to this ideal "si l'amour des esperitz conioingt les corps." So in this dialogue are introduced "deux femmes parlantes"—and he adds slyly, "selon que bien est leur coustume"—"lesquelles sont de bien differente nature, et diuerses meurs." The character of each of these women is indicated by their names: the first one being called Eulalie, "nom de

femme uulgar aux Allemands, est interpretée de Grec en Francoys, bien parlante." The other, Xanthippe, "signifiant cheual roux, c'est à dire, beste de mauluais poil," was the wife of Socrates, known to history as a "femme querelleuse, de mal engin, et de ceste lignée italienne, laquelle porte le surnom de *malatesta*."

Next comes the translation of the dialogue (fo. Aiii), of which the fundamental idea is, as we may surmise, that a wife can manage her husband more easily by anticipating his desires than by quarreling with him. Aneau follows too closely the text of Erasmus as his awkward and unimpressive rendition shows. He is apparently more preoccupied with a desire to carefully translate the elegant Latin phrase of Erasmus, than he is with the force and flexibility of his French. A citation or two will suffice to show the quality of his effort. The two women meet apparently in the street, and after they have exchanged greetings, Xanthippe remarks that Eulalie is more "belle et iolye" than ever, and wishes to know who has presented her with such beautiful clothes. To which Eulalie replies,

"D'ont conuient il, que les femmes honestes
Recoiuent dons: prennent presentz cheriz,
Fors seulement de leurs propres maris?

X.: O que tu es heureuse, et en repos
D'auoir trouué un si loyal espoux!
Iaymasse mieulx auoir prins un fol (las!)
Quand i'espousay mon mary Nicolas.

E.: Pourquoy cela? et pour quel grand desdaing,
Conuient il mal entre nous si soubdain?

X.: Ne conuiendra par le DIEV immortel,
A tout iamais avec un homme tel.
Regarde: au lieu d'habitz pour tout l'an beaulx (Aiiii)
Comme ie suys dessiré en lambeaulx,
Il souffre bien sa femme ainsi courir,
Aller, trotter: Mais ie puisse mourir,
Le plus souuent, si ie n'ay tresgrand honte
De sortir hors, quand ie descendz ou monte
En lieu public, et les aultres ie uoy,
Qui ont maris plus pauures que ie n'ay
Comme elles sont braues, et mieulx en point."

Perhaps the most characteristic verses of the poem are those with which Eulalie closes the dialogue:

“De blasmer mon mary
 Deuant les gents, en presence d'aultruy,
 Surtout gardoie, aussi nulle querelle
 Hors la maison, dire ou porter, car elle
 Est plus en paix facilement remise,
 Quand entre deux seulement est commise.
 Mais s'il y a quelque cas, ou danger
 Que l'on ne peut supporter ou changer,
 Par enhorter, ne par douleur refraindre
 Plus ciuil est se douloir, et complaindre
 Vers les parentz du mary, que les siens
 Les plus prudentz, les plus anciens.”

If Aneau's poetical translation is stiff and unwieldy, his prose effort is much more successful. The *Oraison ou Epistre de M. Tulle Ciceron a Octaue, depuis surnommé Auguste Caesar* was translated in 1542.²⁰ After the dedicatory preface, which, as we have indicated above, is addressed to Mellin de Saint-Gelais, there is (Dii vo.) *a dixain sur l'epistre s cuiante escripte par Ciceron peu auant sa mort*, which is conceived as follows:

Le Cygne chante, approchant de mort l'heure ;
 Le pourceau crie, ayant de mort doubtance.
 Le Cerf legier mourir innocent pleure ;
 L'homme gemit : craignant la consequence.
 Ainsi chantant, en douleur d'eloquence,

²⁰ *Oraison ou/Epistre de M./Tville Ciceron, a/Octaue, Depuis/surnommé/ Auguste Caesar, tour/née en Francois./ On les vend a Lyon en la rue Merciere /par Pierre de Tours./ 1542./* In-8 de 8 ff. non chiffr., car. goth., sign. D iii, Bibl. nat., Rés. pX45. Nicéron (XXII, pp. 170-7, Paris, 1733), following La Croix du Maine, gives 1543 as the date of publication of this work. This is no doubt a typographical error. Among the MSS. of the library of Lyons is a very interesting copy of the *Oraison*, bound with a copy of the *Lyon Marchant*, both written in a nineteenth century hand (no. 1038, *Catalogue de MSS. de la Bibl. de Lyon*, Paris, 1900, vol. II, p. 901). On a fly-leaf is the following note by M. Cochard: “Très rare . . . La copie qu'on voit ici de ce livre n'est pas plus connue que l'original. Elle a été achetée 95 livres chez Techener en 1829. Elle vient de la bibl. de M. Langs, de Londres.” The city library possesses a printed copy purchased by M. Coste for 900 livres at the Soleilne sale (*fonds Coste*, II, 734). For another copy of the *Lyon Marchant*, cf. the same *Catalogue*, vol. I, p. 501, also in a nineteenth century hand (no. 1617).

Ainsi crient, en exclamation,
Ainsi pleurant, en triste affection,
Ainsi plaignant son innocent desin,
Marc Ciceron en dernière action
De Cygne, Porc, Cerf, et homme eut la fin.

The Epistle itself is very brief, filling only seven pages and a half, and is rendered in a very easy manner. In fact, Aneau's prose compares quite favorably with any contemporary work. It is true that many of the Roman legal, military, and other terms are scarcely recognizable in the strange garb of the sixteenth century, yet this is not exceptional. We find similar anachronisms, for example, in Peletier's translation of the *Odyssey*. A few lines will suffice to give an idea of the vigor of Aneau's style:

“Quelles choses auant que tu les demandasses : plus grandes que tu ne les voulois, et plus d'aduantage que tu n'en esperois : ne te a donné le Senat? Il te a donné les hallebardiers : affin qu'il eust un deffenseur avec autorité, et non pas affin qu'il te armast à l'encontre de soy mesme. Il t'appella Empereur : attribuant à toy icelluy honneur, pour auoir repouslé l'armée des ennemys : non pas pour ce que icelle armée fuyante, defaicte par sa propre tuerie te nommast Empereur (fo. Diiii vo.).”

And the translation closes with the following words:

“Toutes lesquelles choses (si par aultre ne sont) meantmoins par moy briefvement leur seront rapportées: car si estant vif ces choses fuyr ie ne puys: j'ay deliberay (*sic*) avec icelles fuyr la vie.”

It is indeed a long step from the rounded and well balanced phrases of Cicero to the rocky and unstable sentence of Aneau, but after all are not works of art like men in that they resemble the period in which they are created? Their value is only relative. “Le critique,” says M. Haag, “qui jugerait de l'art égyptien d'après les principes de l'art grec ne commetttrait pas une plus grande faute, que celui qui fait abstraction des temps et des lieux pour apprécier le mérite d'un artiste ou d'un écrivain.”²¹ So in passing judgment on the work of Aneau, we must not fail to take these facts into consideration. He cannot be separated from his *milieu*. His works are, according to M. Cochard, “marqués au coin d'un goût assez bon pour le temps et empreints de cette érudition classique qui

²¹ *La France Protestante*, 2nd ed., 1877-1888, vol. 1.

était alors à la mode."²² He is but one of many who are adding their quota toward the development of a firm and beautiful prose. Not a genius, he belongs distinctly to his time; and, as Sainte-Beuve has well shown, it is in the secondary authors that we find a faithful picture of the life of a period. It is that above all which renders Aneau interesting.²³

²² Cochard, *op. cit.*, p. 200.

²³ The volume closes with the *Vers de Corneil Seuere Poete Romain, sur la mort de Ciceron, tournez en vers Francois, iouxte les Latins* (ff. Dvii ro., and Dviii), a mediocre effort of which a few lines will suffice to give an idea:

ICelluy chef iadis si bien orant
 Pour les grādz gēs, presque encore spirāt,
 Fut mis au crocq, en son lieu Sanatoire
 D'ond tous rauit par celle mort notoire.
 Comme si seulle en ce public dommage
 De Ciceron mis a mort fust l'image.
 De Iuy Consul l'ors viennent es pensées
 Les actes grandz, les bendes amassées
 Des conuirez, l'alliance surprise
 Des nobles gens, le crime, et l'entreprinse.
 Le vengement de Cethege puny
 Aussi reuient Catilin forbanny
 Par son faulx vueil. Qu'ont profité faueur?
 Et cōpaignie, et vœulx ans pleins d'honneurs?
 Son eage aussi auxl sacreez ars donnée?
 L'honneur du siècle vne seulle journée
 A emporté. Et en court Palatine
 En plain Senat, de la langue latine
 Frappée en dueil la tres triste eloquence
 Par vn seul coup a perdu la loquence.

JOHN L. GERIG

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

(*To be continued*)

LOS YERROS DE NATURALEZA Y ACIERTOS DE LA
FORTUNA, BY DON ANTONIO COELLO AND
DON PEDRO CALDERÓN DE LA BARCA¹

THIS play has only recently been included in the list of Calderón's dramatic productions. Hence it has never been made the subject of a special study, although it merits attention both for its own sake and its undoubted relationship to Calderón's masterpiece, *La vida es sueño*. A brief account of the play and the autograph manuscript in which it is preserved may therefore be of some interest.

Mesonero Romanos and Barrera both state that this piece was written by Antonio Coello in collaboration with his younger brother Juan.² This ascription of authorship was generally accepted until Señor Paz y Melia pronounced it the joint work of Antonio Coello and Calderón.³ Both of the first mentioned authorities unfortunately neglect to state their reasons for attributing a portion of the play to Juan Coello, but as Barrera mentions having seen a print of the same, it is probable that he accepted without question some statement of authorship therein found.⁴ Although he mentions the autograph MS., then in the Osuna library, it is not probable that he studied it carefully. Certainly this MS. offers no evidence that Juan Coello had a hand in the writing of the play; quite the contrary. Señor Paz y Melia thinks that Act I is probably written in the hand of Antonio Coello; Act II, he says, is entirely in that of Calderón; both these hands, and no others, appear in Act III. My own observation is confirmatory of this opinion. Comparison of the autograph MSS. of *El*

¹ I wish to express my thanks to Señor Paz y Melia for the very obliging assistance he has rendered me in the preparation of this article.

² Cf. Mesonero Romanos *Catálogo cronológico y alfabetico, Dramáticos contemporáneos de Lope de Vega*, vol. II, p. liv; Barrera, *Catálogo*, p. 95.

³ Paz y Melia, *Catálogo*, p. 547.

⁴ That this print is very rare is indicated by the fact that it is not to be found in the British Museum, Bibliothèque Nationale, Ticknor collection, nor Hispanic Society Library. I have not yet succeeded in finding a copy. Barrera, as usual, does not state where he found the print.

mágico prodigioso, that of *La selva confusa*, that of *Troya abrasada* (Acts II and III), with the second hand of this play has convinced me that the parts in question were penned by one and the same individual. Whatever the evidence upon which Mesonero Romanos and Barrera based their attribution, it cannot be as trustworthy as that afforded by the original MS.

This MS. is now in the possession of the Biblioteca Nacional, Madrid. It bears the catalogue number 14,778. In Paz y Melia's catalogue, it is number 3,542. It consists of 56 quarto folios. On the cover of Act I, besides the title given above, occurs the name Don Antonio Coello, the only author which the MS. names. This act shows but one hand. It is probably, though not certainly, that of Coello. The second act, written wholly in Calderón's hand, begins with the words *Jhs Maria Joseph*. As is well known, Calderón usually began each act with this pious formula, although such was not his invariable custom. For example, the words stand before each act of the *Mágico prodigioso*; they do not occur in *La selva confusa*; they introduce Acts II and III of *Troya abrasada*, and do not stand before Act I of that play, which was the work of Zabaleta. In *Los yerros de naturaleza*, the formula appears only in this one place; for although Calderón contributed Act III, he did not begin that act.

After this formula comes the following title, which, as will be seen, differs slightly from that given by Coello: *Daños de naturaleza y aciertos de la fortuna*. Next comes this *reparto*:

Polidoro	} Sa. Autora.
Matilde	
Tabaco	Veçon.
Federico	Liñan.
Fisberto	Autor.
Sigismundo	Salbador.
Filipo	Nauia.
Rosaura	Bernarda.
Policena	Ana Maria.
Criados	Marcos y Matias.

The fact that the *reparto* stands, quite contrary to custom, before Act II rather than before Act I, would seem to indicate that

the second of the two collaborators was in closer touch with the actors and had general oversight of the staging of the piece. Perhaps Calderón had been commissioned to provide a play, and in order to fill the contract quickly, he farmed out part of the work to Coello. The *reparto* of *Troya abrasada* is likewise in Calderón's hand, although in that case, it stands before Act I, which he did not write.

The identification of some of these actors is easy; that of others difficult or uncertain. The player who took the comic part of Tabaco is beyond question Juan Bezón the celebrated *gracioso* whose real name was Gregorio de Rojas, a half brother of the famous Francisco de Rojas Zorilla.⁵ The *graciosa* of the cast is almost certainly Ana María de Peralta, wife of the former and commonly called La Bezona.⁶ The Liñán mentioned may be Domingo Liñán, whom we know to have been playing during the years 1633 and 1634.⁷ Salvator is probably Salvador de Lara, though possibly Jaime Salvador.⁸ I can find no record of an actor named Nauia. The identity of Bernarda is likewise doubtful. She may be Bernarda Gamarra, Bernarda Ramírez, or Bernarda Villaroel.⁹ The Marcos of the cast is probably Marcos de Herrera, and Matías, I take to be Juan Matías Molina.¹⁰ When there is so much uncertainty regarding the identification of so many members of the cast, the task of determining definitely the identity of the *autor* and *autora* is rendered very difficult. They may, perhaps, be Cristóbal Avendaño and his wife María Candau. Avendaño died shortly after the time when this play was produced, and his widow married a Salvador de Lara, who, as already said, may be the Salvator of the cast. We know that Bezón and his wife Ana María were with Avendaño in 1632, and with Francisco López in 1636. They may have left their old company as a result of their manager's death. We know that Bernarda de Villaroel was with Avendaño in 1622, and that Marcos de Herrera and Juan Matías

⁵ Rennert, *The Spanish Stage* (New York, 1909), p. 435.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 417.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 505.

⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 501, 593.

⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 479, 565, 593.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 494, 520.

were in his company in 1632. While the above cast may represent the troupe of another manager, it seems most probable that the *autor* in question was Avendaño, although there are insufficient data to prove the fact.¹¹

As has been stated, the whole of Act II, is in Calderón's hand. Coello's or, at all events, the first hand, begins in Act III, with the 28 verses of Filipo's introductory monologue. At this point Calderón's hand begins again and continues through the next four folios, ending abruptly in the middle of a scene. From here on the other hand continues to the end. Calderón, therefore, contributed only about a quarter of this act. At the end are to be found the following *licencias*:

Vea esta comedia Don Geronimo de Villanueva. En Madrid á 4 de Mayo de 1634. Esta comedia está escrita como de dos tan grandes ingenios. Puedese representar.

D. Geronimo de Villanueva.

It will be observed that the censor, who was doubtless in a position to know, distinctly states that the play is the work of two authors, thus confirming the evidence of the hands. It is therefore highly improbable that Juan Coello participated as a third collaborator. Calderón's signature, however, nowhere appears. It was his usual custom to affix it at the beginning or end of those plays which were entirely of his own composition. As is well known, he was completely indifferent to those plays which he wrote in collaboration. None of them is included in the list of comedias he prepared for the Duke of Veragua. In the present instance, it is doubtful whether he cared to have it known that he was one of the joint authors. The fly-leaf mentions the name of Coello alone, just as that of the *Troya abrasada* mentions only the name of Zaballeta. So far as Calderón was concerned, *Los yerros de naturaleza* appears to have been a bit of pot-boiling, written for profit and nothing more. The part written by Calderón shows a greater number of corrections than that contributed by Coello, so that Calderón's portion appears to be a *borrador*; that of Coello a *tras-*

¹¹ Cf. Cotarelo y Mori, *Tirso de Molina* (Madrid, 1893), p. 202, for the list of actors who composed Avendaño's troupe in 1632. Data as to its make-up in 1634 are wanting.

lado. In spite of some evidence of hasty writing, the style of Act II attests to Calderón's authorship. Numerous passages have the genuine Calderonian ring. One of these I shall quote by way of example:

Sobre aquese mirador,
cuyo contorno de piedra
las lazadas de las flores
el río de plata argentan,
estaba, siendo ¡ay de mí!
arbitro su gran belleza
entre la tierra y el agua
de la hermosa competencia,
con que la playa de vidro,
con que de carmin la selva,
o con matices se rríca
o con espuma se encrespa.
La inconstancia de las olas,
de las ojas la violencia,
que en verdes golfos y aúoles
vñas con otras se enuentran,
o su gran melancolia
que á tanto estremo la fuerça
la enajenaron de suerte
que, desvanecida y ciega,
o ella furiosa se arroja
o vencida se despeña.
Cayo, pues, del mirador
donde su rrara velleza
como sol murio en las ondas,
sin que de quantos pasean
el terrero uno pudiese
ayudarla y socorrerla.
Tanto que de su cadáver
el agua ufana y soberbia
se entregó, desbanecida
de que á sus espumas buelba
la Venus, y que despumas
vna nazca y otra muera.
Y como la noche ya
estiente sus alas negras,

y aqui el rrio se desata
con tan rrapida violencia,
no fue posible.

Calderón's portion of the play is much more poetical than Coello's. Most of Coello's plays were written in collaboration. He assisted Calderón in the writing of at least three other plays: *El privilegio de las mugeres*; *La fingida Arcadia*; and *El pastor Fido*. Montalbán was a third partner in writing the first of these. The date is 1623.¹² Moreto contributed one act toward *La fingida Arcadia*. Inasmuch as *El pastor Fido*, to which Antonio Solis y Rivadeneira also contributed an act, is a *fiesta real*, Hartzenbusch thinks that it may have been written after Calderón's retirement from the secular stage in 1651. He states that the piece was written prior to 1656, when the work was printed for the second time.¹³ As Coello died in 1652, Hartzenbusch should have mentioned that year as the last possible posterior date. Antonio Coello was one of those friends with whom Calderón maintained the closest literary relations, and the date of *Los yerros de naturaleza* proves that their literary partnership was continued over a considerable number of years.

The following is an abstract of the plot of *Los yerros de naturaleza*: Act I.

The scene is the Court of Poland. At the shout "Viva Polidoro," the Infanta Matilde enters, beside herself with jealous rage. The courtiers vainly strive to calm her. She refuses to state the nature of her annoyance to any save her aged and trusty guardian, Filipo. The rest withdraw and she proceeds to tell her story. It appears that Manfredo, King of Poland, had died leaving his throne to his only daughter Clorinele (also written Clorilene and Clorine). Civil war resulted and the faction which prevailed was that headed by Conrado, brother to the late king and Matilde's father. To give to his usurpations the color of legality, he promulgated a Salic law debarring females from the throne of Poland. Clorinele was bestowed as a bride upon Filipo. By her Filipo had two children, Sigismundo and Rosaura. Conrado had by his wife twin children, Matilde who was the first born, and Polidoro a son. The two children are exactly alike as regards

¹² *Comedias de Calderón* (ed. Hartzenbusch), vol. IV, p. 667.

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 678.

personal appearance, but different in disposition. Matilde is brave, ambitious and virile; Polidoro, good-natured and weak. This at least is how Polidoro appears to his sister; but as the play proceeds, the reader perceives that he is only to a slight degree less violent and tyrannical than Matilde herself. There is much inconsistency throughout in the portrayal of Polidoro's character. The lion, king of the beasts, has claws; the rose, queen of the flowers, has thorns; a king of men, too, so argues Matilde, should make his rule respected by aggressive action. This she thinks Polidoro cannot do. Nature has made a capital error in lodging the manly soul in the female body, and the effeminate nature in a male body. The very sight of Polidoro, the mere sound of his name, stirs Matilde to fits of jealous passion. Conrado, engaged in a war against Moscovia, had taken Polidoro with him. Conrado had perished in battle and to-day Polidoro is returning, an applauded victor, to claim his throne. This is more than Matilde can endure. She hints at a plot against her brother, and is about to solicit Filipo's aid when interrupted by the entrance of Sigismundo.¹⁴ The latter tells his father that Polidoro has remarked his absence and urges him to go out and greet the victor. Filipo complies and the two go, leaving Matilde alone. In an impassioned soliloquy she hints at a love at variance with her ambition. The Count Fisberto, entering, learns that he is the object of that love. This unexpected news flatters rather than pleases him, for his flame is Rosaura, whom he continues to worship in spite of her scorn. Fisberto urges Matilde to go forth and greet her brother. This she haughtily refuses to do.

Next comes a comic scene between Tabaco, Polidoro's servant, and Policena, Rosaura's maid. Much ridicule is heaped upon the then still novel habits of smoking and snuff-taking.¹⁵ Tabaco is bearer of a *billet-doux* from his master to Rosaura. Rosaura enters, tearing up a similar missive just received from the love-lorn Fisberto. Policena sensibly urges her mistress to treat Fisberto

¹⁴ The interrupted narrative was a device employed by all the dramatists of the time, but it is especially common in Calderón's writings. It is to be found in nearly all his plays. So far as the plot is concerned, the influence of each collaborator probably extended beyond those portions of the play that he personally wrote. In a play of such complexity, there must have been consultation and careful planning before pen was set to paper. In *Auristela y Lisidente*, twin sisters are rivals for a throne. In that instance, there is doubt as to which is the elder.

¹⁵ Cf. the article by Julio Monreal, *Los tomatabaco en el siglo XVII*, *Almanaque de la Ilustración Española y Americana* for the year 1886. (Cited by Bonilla in his edition of the *Diablo cojuelo*, Madrid, 1910, p. 235.) In *Céfalo y Pocris*, Calderón introduces a clown of the same name.

with more kindness, for his intentions are honorable, whereas a marriage with the king is scarcely to be counted upon. But Rosaura shows so clearly that she favors the king, that Tabaco, who has been in hiding, now emerges from behind the arras and declares that her lover is without the door, only awaiting an opportunity to enter her apartment. Enter Polidoro with Federico his confidant. While the lovers are talking, Filipo comes in. The intruders start to hide, but it is too late. Filipo roundly berates Polidoro for his conduct. This rebuke incenses Polidoro, who answers that by making Rosaura his mistress he, a king, is sufficiently honoring her. Filipo, angered, replies that his children are Manfredo's grandchildren, and, as such, have a better claim to the throne than has Polidoro himself. Polidoro's reply is to strike the aged Filipo. Sigismundo enters in time to see this. The king and his attendants withdraw. Rosaura declares that all the love she once bore the king has, as a result of this action, turned to hatred, and, if her brother will not avenge the wrong, she will do so herself. Sigismundo promises to kill Polidoro. Filipo urges him not to do so, quoting the familiar doctrine that a king cannot offend. It will be seen that he has now shifted his ground. Sigismundo assents to this, but contends that he, not Polidoro, is Poland's legitimate king and that therefore the blow, coming from an inferior, is doubly an affront. Seeing no other way to restrain his rash son, Filipo shouts "Treason!" and forces Sigismundo to postpone all thought of vengeance and run for his life. Filipo's chief concern is that people shall consider the incident of the blow a mark of disrespect (*desaire*) merely and not an insult (*agravio*). The question hinges upon whether one should or should not consider Polidoro the lawful king. Such technicalities, growing out of the observance of the point of honor, possessed a singular interest for Calderón, as everybody knows. He devised the most extraordinary situations, involving his heroes in dilemmas where they sadly needed the services of a lawyer to tell them the proper course for a man of honor to pursue. Such quibbling as that of Filipo here is especially characteristic of Calderón and betrays his influence, yet in at least one respect Filipo and Sigismundo do not act in accordance with the usual Calderonian code. Neither father nor brother makes any attempt upon the life of the dishonored Rosaura. If Calderón had had the writing of the first act, the plot might have developed differently.

Although Filipo considers the blow a mark of disrespect and not an affront, he nevertheless feels that the case demands some sort of satisfaction, the more so as his daughter's honor is also involved. An open vengeance would imply that he considered the

blow an affront, consequently his vengeance must be of a subterranean sort. At this psychological moment, Matilde returns to resume the interrupted conversation. She bluntly asserts that Polidoro must die. Filipo objects that such a murder would be useless, as Matilde would still be ineligible to rule in accordance with the terms of the Salic law. Matilde then reveals the whole plot. She plans to feign her own death, while secretly murdering Polidoro. After this has been accomplished, she will come out of hiding, and, assuming her twin brother's name and garb, rule in his stead. Fate must right the wrongs of nature, and she herself proposes to compel the fates. Filipo, who sees in this plot an opportunity to aid Matilde, to whom he is devoted, and also to satisfy his private grudge, readily promises co-operation. But loyalty and lust for vengeance are at war within him. He secretly tries to devise a way to reconcile the demands of both.

Act II. Rosaura now begins to lend a willing ear to Fisberto's suit. Polidoro, who is jealous, commissions Tabaco to bear her a letter. If he returns with an answer, he is to receive a reward of 1,000 crowns whether the reply be favorable or otherwise. Polidoro mysteriously cautions Fisberto not to aspire too high. Fisberto naturally supposes that the king suspects him of paying court to Matilde, and, to allay the monarch's suspicion, makes a formal demand for Rosaura's hand. The effect of this is not what he had anticipated, but Polidoro is spared the embarrassing necessity of making a reply by reason of a sudden uproar which has arisen within the palace. Filipo enters and announces that Matilde is dead. In reality, she has pushed a slave into the water to make a splash and has then concealed herself, pretending to be drowned.¹⁶ The next step in the plot was to be the murder of Polidoro; but Filipo's loyalty will not permit him to go that length; his vengeance will be sufficient if he can but deprive the reigning monarch of his throne. Meanwhile, Sigismundo has been living in concealment in the vaults of a ruined castle hard by. He issues forth at night, hoping to meet Polidoro. While concealed in a balcony, he overhears the latter confess to Federico that he is jealous of Fisberto. Lacking an opportunity to slay the king, Sigismundo escapes. His departure is noticed, and Federico and Fisberto, who has just arrived, disobey the king's express orders and go in quest of the intruder, leaving Polidoro unprotected. Filipo and Matilde seize this opportunity to bind and gag him. Filipo carries him away, while Matilde, donning his attire, begins to reign in his stead. Throughout the piece, one actress played the rôles of Polidoro and Matilde. In this, the only scene where the twins appear together

¹⁶ The heroine of Lope's *Esclavo de Roma* employs the same stratagem.

on the stage, the part of Polidoro is momentarily taken by a supernumerary. Federico and Fisberto return from their search, bringing with them a man captured in the purlieus of the ruined castle. This man had requested to be led into the king's presence, stating that he had matters of grave import to communicate. He now stands before Matilde, his face concealed by his cape.¹⁷ The situation is tense, for the audience must have thought that the mysterious stranger was Sigismundo. But the spectators were soon undeceived. The stranger casts aside his disguise and one sees that it is Filipo. He privately assures Matilde that her brother is dead and his body concealed. In reality Polidoro lies a prisoner in the vaults of the ruined tower. There now ensue several incidents somewhat analogous to the ingenious confusions of Shakespeare's *Comedy of Errors*. The courtiers take up with Matilde the interrupted conversation which they had begun with Polidoro. Matilde, seeing the danger of discovery, picks a quarrel with Federico, Polidoro's confidant, and banishes him to his estates. Fisberto, whom she loves, is now made favorite. The luckless Tabaco is the next to offend the "king" by making derogatory remarks about the supposedly deceased Matilde. The latter in a rage threatens to throw Tabaco from a balcony. The *gracioso* now hands Matilde a letter which he had succeeded in obtaining from Rosaura, and claims the promised reward of 1,000 crowns. Instead, he receives a severe drubbing at the hands of the virago in male attire. The letter informs Matilde that Rosaura is about to give herself to Fisberto the man she herself loves! Naturally, her jealousy is aroused but the peril of her situation forces her to disimulate.

Act III. Filipo is eager to inform Sigismundo of the recent *coup d'état*, lest by mistake the latter offer violence to Matilde, thinking her to be Polidoro; but Sigismundo's lurking-place cannot be discovered. Matilde treats with unmerited severity three worthy petitioners. It is now evident that the ruler of Poland is a tyrant of the worst sort. The kingdom groans beneath the yoke, and the oppressed subjects begin to show signs of revolt. In order to break off the threatened match between Fisberto and Rosaura, Matilde continues the suit begun by Polidoro, and offers to make Rosaura Poland's queen.¹⁸ This situation appeals to Filipo's sense

¹⁷ In Act II of *Troya abrasada*, one of the acts written by Calderón, Sinon is led blindfolded into Priam's presence, and then by a very similar *coup de théâtre* reveals his identity.

¹⁸ This is a very common motive in Spanish plays. In Tirso's *Don Gil de las calzas verdes*, for example, Doña Juana interferes in the love affairs of her faithless lover by donning male attire and winning the love of her rival. The

of humor, but Rosaura, not being in the secret, is disposed to take matters seriously. But the end is at hand. Sigismundo contrives to gain an entrance into the palace. He stabs to death Matilde whom he mistakes for Polidoro. As he leaves the room, he encounters Filipo who is at first horrified at the deed, but almost immediately recognizes that his son is merely the instrument of Divine Providence. Father and son now secretly restore Polidoro to his palace. At first the latter wonders whether he is not dreaming.¹⁹ Have not all his past grandeurs been illusion? Is not the existence he has led for twelve days in the castle crypt the only reality he has ever known? As he asks himself these questions, a startled multitude of his subjects overruns the palace. Recognizing Federico among the throng, Polidoro greets him with his wonted cordiality, much to the latter's surprise. All present now demand an explanation. Filipo alone holds the key to the enigma. He explains all. Polidoro has been wonderfully chastened by his late experiences. He is awed by the mysterious ways of Providence, and resolves henceforth to be a model sovereign. He makes an auspicious beginning by pardoning all his enemies. He rights the wrongs done Filipo and his family by making Rosaura his wife and Sigismundo commander-in-chief of his army.

This résumé of the plot is sufficient to show that *Los yerros de naturaleza* is reminiscent of *La vida es sueño* or vice versa. The parallels occur both in the portions originating with Coello, and in those which are attributable to Calderón himself. More than any of his contemporaries, the latter poet was prone to self-repetition. This inveterate propensity of his has been commented upon by many critics but by none more happily than by James Russell Lowell:

"I am quite conscious how much sameness there is in him, and yet there is endless variety too, and if his horizon be not of the widest, heat-lightnings of fancy are forever winking round the edges of it. Partly, perhaps, the charm is in the language and the verse, which slips along thoughtless as a brook. There are greater poets,

same situation occurs in Lope's *Ansueto de Fenisa*. In Calderón's *Afecto de odio y amor*, Cristerna promises to bestow her hand upon the knight who shall slay her enemy. The one who wins the right to marry her turns out to be a woman. Many more instances might be cited.

¹⁹ It would be superfluous to cite the words uttered by Heraclio and Leonido when they are restored to their original estate after a brief period of rule. The analogy which *En esta vida todo es verdad y todo mentira* offers to *La vida es sueño* has often been noted.

but none so constantly delightful. His mind is a kaleidoscope, at every turn making a new image of the same bits of colored glass—cheap material enough but who cares? Not so cheap either when one comes to think of it, for these are fragments from painted windows, deepened in hue with incense fumes and thrilled through and through with organ and choir. Well, it is a comfort that there *used* to be poets, at any rate, only it is a despair to see how easily they did it.²⁰

Calderón, then seldom employed an incident, dramatic situation, or figure of speech once without using it again or many times. His was a talent for arrangement and combination rather than for invention. It is of interest to inquire just how these two plays parallel each other.

First of all, they have in common three names, Sigismundo, Rosaura, and Clorilene. The last character is merely referred to in both plays. The name had been made popular by Suárez de Mendoza y Figueroa's novel *Eustorgio y Clorilene*. Sigismundo is not a common appellation in Calderón's drama. Aside from the two plays in question, it occurs only in his *Afectos de odio y amor*, although it is occasionally to be found in the works of other authors both before and after his time. The name Rosaura, too, is equally rare in Calderón. Besides these plays, I find it only in *El mejor amigo el muerto*. Rosarda is of more frequent occurrence. Nevertheless, these were all stock names and their use in this play would in itself be of no significance. But taken in connection with other and stronger points of resemblance, the choice of them does not seem to have been accidental.

Matilde and Polidoro, although lacking the external roughness of some of Calderón's other monsters such as Segismundo in *La vida es sueño* and Heracio and Leonido in *En esta vida todo es verdad y todo mentira*, were in all other respects identical. Matilde is haughty, violent, and tyrannical. She attacks and threatens the *gracioso* just as in the other play Segismundo berates the *criado*.

Si en tu vida
me entras aquí ¡vive el cielo!
que te echo por un balcón.

²⁰ *Letters of James Russell Lowell* (New York, 1894), vol. II, p. 413.

Compare this with Segismundo's threat:

¡Y vive dios!
si os poneis delante vos,
que os eche por la ventana.²¹

In the second case a murder ensues, in the first it does not; yet Matilde had previously murdered a female slave and plotted her brother's destruction. Polidoro, too, for all he is called a weakling, makes an attempt upon the honor of Rosaura, just as Segismundo did upon that of the other Rosaura. In the one play, the aged Filipo intervenes to save his daughter, just as the elderly Clotaldo appears to save his in the other. Polidoro strikes Filipo; Segismundo tries to murder Clotaldo. Both Polidoro and Segismundo, after brief reigns, are spirited away and imprisoned in castle vaults. Each comes to regard his brief period of rule as a dream; each is thoroughly chastened by the experience, and later, upon being restored to the throne, undergoes a change of heart and becomes a just and humane monarch. Coello, who wrote this portion of the

²¹ Curiously enough, Professor Schevill, *The Comedias of Diego Ximénez de Enciso*, PMLA, vol. XVIII, p. 205, quotes an exactly similar passage from the 1773 version of *El príncipe Don Carlos*, to show the resemblance which that play offers to *La vida es sueño*. Since then, Dr. Crawford has made the interesting discovery that this particular version was written not by Enciso but by Cañizares, MLN, vol. XXII, p. 240. The genuine Enciso version, licensed in 1633, still offers many interesting parallels. Schevill holds that Calderón's play followed Enciso's. This opinion though probable, has not been positively demonstrated. As for the threat to throw an offending individual through a window or down from a balcony, that is a very conventional manifestation of anger in the works not only of Calderón, but of other dramatists as well. In *En esta vida todo es verdad y todo mentira*, Leonido says:

§ No tiene
este palacio ventanas,
por donde, volando, vuelva
más presto?

In *Troya abrasada*, Casandra thus addresses Elena:

Tan ciega estoy
que podra ser que mi vana
alтивez su yra os advierta,
y si no acertais la puerta,
salgais por vna ventana.

Cf. also Moreto, *El defensor de su agravio* (ed. Fernández-Guerra y Orbe), p. 505 c.

play, fails to bring out the thought that this life is merely a dream, and that it therefore behooves one to prepare for the awakening into the reality of the life to come. The main thesis of *La vida es sueño* is therefore lacking in *Los yerros de naturaleza*.

Nevertheless, the play has some slight claim to be classed as a philosophical drama. Its thesis is this: Man proposes but God disposes, one of the main thoughts of *La vida es sueño*. Basilio sought to cheat the fates by an ingenious subterfuge. Matilde strove to remedy what she conceived to be an error of nature. But fortune, which as Calderón uses the word, is only another name for Divine Providence, thwarted the designs of both. When Basilio tampered with destiny, he accomplished nothing but the hastening of his own overthrow. Matilde endeavored to alter the course of nature, and thereby brought about her own death. But, on the other hand, Segismundo overcame his baleful horoscope in the only way in which, according to Calderón, one can overcome it, by means of an assertion of his own free-will in the direction of righteousness.

Porque el hado más esquivo,
la inclinacion más violenta,
el planeta más impio,
sólo el albedrio inclinan,
no fuerzan el albedrio.

And when the fates intervene to restore Polidoro to his throne, he, too, by an effort of the will changes his whole nature. But it would be conveying a false impression to insist too much upon the moral lesson contained in this play. The plot was the matter of supreme importance to the poets who wrote it. Their object was to amuse, and earn money. The moral is barely touched upon. One cannot but regret that Calderón rather than Coello did not write the conclusion.

That the two plays under discussion are mutually related, seems to me self-evident. To which of the two should be awarded the honor of priority? Professor Buchanan, to cite only the latest one who has attempted to determine the date of *La vida es sueño*, thinks that piece was written between August 1, 1631, and November 6, 1635.²² The latter date is the time of the licensing of the

²² *La vida es sueño* (ed. Buchanan, Toronto, 1909), p. 101.

first part of Calderón's printed plays. The play, then, may well have appeared a number of years before this. *Los yerros de naturaleza* was licensed May 4, 1634, and was probably written almost immediately before that date. I see no positive proof that the Coello-Calderón play was written after *La vida es sueño*, although it is highly probable that such was the case. At all events, the new evidence afforded by this play will serve to lend force and plausibility to the contentions of those who would assign to Calderón's masterpiece an earlier date than the extreme posterior limit mentioned.

GEORGE TYLER NORTHUP

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY.

MISCELLANEOUS

A DESCRIPTION OF VAUCLUSE: A NOTE ON PETRARCH TOPOGRAPHY

THE river on which Petrarch saw his lady Laura and her companions (Sonnet, *Dodici donne*), has been variously identified¹ as the Coulon, the Rhone and the Durance. Professor Francesco Flaminii in his recent book, *Tra Valchiusa ed Avignone*,² thinks the river is the Sorgue. He gives various reasons, among others that the Rhone would be too swift for such a boating party, that the Durance is not a navigable river, but that the Sorgue is navigable and at the same time gentle enough for a pleasure party of this sort. A chapter from a manuscript³ in the National Library of Florence is interesting not only as giving testimony to the navigability of the Sorgue at a period but little later than that of Petrarch, but especially for its accurate description of the fountain of Vaucluse itself. The chapter in question follows, printed according to the text of the manuscript:

Nelle parti di Provenza ae uno picholo e belissimo paese et magnio, dovizioso di molti beni, il quale si chiama Venisi,⁴ nel quale ae un chastello chessi⁵ Val di Chiusa. Di costa a questo chastello escie una grandisima e maravigliosa fontana, e di grande abondanza d'aqua chiara come el cristallo, dolcie e buona, sanza nullo

¹ The Rhone or the Durance are suggested in *Le Rime di Francesco Petrarca, con note di Tassoni, Muzio e Muratori*, Roma, 1821; the Coulon, in *Il Petrarca con l'espositione d'Alessandro Vellutello*, Vinegia, 1554. Most commentators do not try to identify the river.

² *Tra Valchiusa ed Avignone. La scena degli amori del Petrarca. Note di topografica Petrarchesca*; in Supplemento no. 12 al *Giornale Storico della Letteratura italiana*, Torino, 1910, pp. 135-136.

³ Cod. Magliabechiano XXI, 135. This chapter (fol. 58v) is the last one of a section entitled *Di pietre ed altre chose belle*, which is appended to a bestiary, called in the table of contents of the volume, *Isidoro della natura degli animali in volgare*. The manuscript is of the fifteenth century. The writer intends to publish later a critical edition of this bestiary.

⁴ The Comtat-Venaissin (Comitatus Venaissini, comté de Venisse, comté Venaissin), of which the capital was Venasque, and later Carpentras.

⁵ Some such word as *chiama* is evidently omitted.

sapore; la qual fontana escie d'una altissima montagnia dirocata a maniera d'uno diritto muro, nella quale rocca sopra essa fonte naschono e figlano aguglie, falchoni, sparvieri e ogni uciello di ratto, e di molti altri salvatici uccielli. La quale fontana gietta per uno pertugio di pietra di questa rocca fatto a maniera d'uno largo pozo chavato giuso profondo, che chon alcuna lunghezza di corda mai non vi si toccho fondo. La fontana gietta il verno, cioè sei mesi dell'ano,⁶ e poi non gietta; ma, a pie di lei nelle rocche di chosta, a sette fontane, sue figliuole, che mai non finano di gittare. Questa colle sette son tutte una, e fanno un fiume si grande che mena ogni grande navilio charicho. Il fiume si chiama la Sorga e corre XV miglia e mette ne Rodano.

M. S. GARVER

YALE UNIVERSITY

A NOTE ON SAINT-GELAIS AND BEMBO

MODERN criticism has well established the fact that the intellectual debt of Europe to Italy, during the Renaissance, was not a matter of general ideas or "influence" only, but that the fruit of Italian brains was as frankly booty as the Italian *objets d'art* with which returning French armies first piqued the taste of their countrymen. Modern scholarship is, piece by piece, discovering stolen Italian treasures embedded in French, English or Spanish literature; and even the casual student of the sixteenth century can hardly fail of such occasional discoveries. Perhaps an especial interest attaches to the earlier instances of literary pilfering. Such an early example—and an example which has, I believe, so far escaped even the acute eye of M. Vianey—is a *huitain* of Saint Gelais' included in the MS. belonging, at the time his poems were edited by Blanchemain, to the Marquis de la Rochetulon. According to Blanchemain, this MS. contains only Saint Gelais' juvenilia, and should be dated about 1535, fifteen years, that is, before the members of the *Pléiade* made barefaced literary theft the vogue. The *huitain* in question¹ runs as follows:

⁶The water, in reality, usually rushes out from the grotto only for some days in March and April, and in October and November. During the rest of the year the river is fed by a number of streams coming from the rock below. Cf. Fredrik Wulff, *Petrarch at Vaucluse*, 1337-1353. With plates and a map. Lund, 1904, p. 22.

¹*Oeuvres* (Bibliothèque Elzévirienne, Paris, 1873), vol. III, p. 84. It is numbered XCI.

Quand j'eu mon feu descouvert à ma Dame
 Et attendu, de demain à demain
 Bien longuement, response de ma flamme,
 A la parfin son vouloir inhumain
 Me presenta sa froide et blanche main.
 Hal dès alors j'entende bien la façon:
 Sans me respondre, elle dict bien à plain
 Que je suis feu et qu'elle est le glaçon."

The source of this poem is a sonnet by Bembo, which, however, opens with an allusion of which Saint-Gelais failed to make use. From Saint-Gelais' poem the reader will probably gather that the lover was awaiting a reply to a written declaration of his passion when the lady's chilly proffered hand gave him his *coup de grâce*. Bembo presents the situation somewhat differently. The lover has seized the opportunity of declaring his love as if merely in jest, although with a warmth his lady understands:

Io ardo dissi; e la risposta in vano,
 Come 'l gioco chiedea, lasso cercai:
 Onde tutto quel giorno e l' altro andai
 Qual uom, ch' è fatto per gran doglia insano.
 Poi che s' avvide ch'io potea lontano
 Esser da quel pensier, più pia che mai,
 Ver me volgendo de' begli occhi i rai,
 Mi porse ignuda la sua bella mano.
 Fredda era più che neve: nè 'n quel punto
 Scorsi il mio mal: tal di dolcezza velo
 M' avea dinanzi ordito il mio desire.
 Or ben mi trovo a duro passo giunto;
 Che s' io non erro, in quella guisa dire
 Volle Madonna a me, com' era un gelo."²

The lover has clearly taken advantage of one of those social games, now relegated to the nursery or the school-room, which so delighted the courtly circles of sixteenth century Italy, and which are seriously reported by authors like Castiglione or Guazzo. The editor of the *Classici Italiani* offers two explanations of it nearly contemporary with Bembo. One is from Quattromani's letters:³

² Sonnet *XXII Rime*. (Soc. Tipografica de' classici Italiani, Milan, 1808),

³ Found "nelle lettere." I have not been able to verify the citation. The *Opere*, vol. II, p. 26.

"Giocandosi ad un gioco ch'è detto del segreto, dove l'un dice una parola all' orecchio all' altro, e poi si manifestano le parole dette. Il Bembo, che sedeva presso la sua Donna, disse: Io ardo. La Donna non potè rispondere al Bembo, perchè la ragion del gioco nol chiedea, ma parlò all' orecchio a quello che seguia dietro a lei; indi a molti giorni porse la mano al Bembo. Prende dunque il Poeta questa cosa per risposta e dice che la sua Donna volle inferire: Se tu ardi, io sono un ghiaccio, e ritorce ed accomoda ogni cosa molto leggiadramente."

The other commentary, Ludovico Dolce's, describes at greater length the "game of the secret" which has descended to modern children as "scandal."⁴ The players, having taken their places,

"a guisa di corona, l'uno dice nell' orecchio al altro alcune parole che sono corrispondenti, e così l'uno all' altro di mano in mano insino che non resta poi alcuno. Di poi il primo recita le sue parole, e così fa il secondo, il terzo, e gli altri, in guisa che se forma un ragionamento continuato ch'è bello ad udire."

Bembo obviously refers to a game perfectly familiar at the time, at least to Italians, a game which has not yet died out. Ignorance of it is, then, the least likely explanation of the fact that an Italianate like Saint-Gelais ignored the allusion and contented himself with the main theme which it was designed to adorn. It is more probable that he omitted it because he was generalizing an incident which it attached to a particular occasion. Or he may have felt that this ornament had too little connection with the real matter of the poem to be, in fact, an ornament, since Bembo, content with his opening allusion, makes no further reference to it, nor connects it with the closing incident, upon which the whole sonnet turns. In such esthetic scruple, modern taste is likely to approve Saint-Gelais.

C. RUUTZ-REES

GREENWICH, CONN.

British Museum possesses an edition of 1714. *Lettere diverse. Il IV libro di Virgilio in verso toscano. Trattato della Metafora, etc. . . . Alcune poesie toscane e latine.* Edited by Matteo Egizio, Naples. B. M., 10905 CCI.

⁴ Found "nel' *Dialogo de' colori*," *Dialogo . . . nel quale si ragiona delle qualità, diversità, proprietà dei colori.* Venice, 1565. I have not been able to verify the citation. The game is mentioned earlier than this in the *Cento Giuocche* of Innocenzo Ringhieri, Venice, 1553, p. 86.

RUMANIAN PLEOAPĂ AND POPOR

Pleoapă, 'eyelid.'

Rumanian *pleoapă* has the meaning of Latin *palpebra*, but the form is strangely different. In correcting Körting's mistakes with regard to Rumanian, Densusianu says: "pleoapă reste une énigme, puisqu'on ne peut l'expliquer par *palpebra*," *Romania*, 1904, 283. Here the specialist has fallen into error himself; every step of the development has fairly close parallels in Rumanian. Illustrations of the principles involved can be found in Tiktin's *Rumänisches Elementarbuch* (Heidelberg, 1905).

By reason of the consonants following *e*, this vowel became strest: *palpébra*. Rumanian commonly forms *ie* from strest open *e*; but this change is lacking after *r*. As there is no trace of an *i* in the derivativ of *palpebra*, we may assume that its *r* was put before *e*, when the stress was well established. We find the same change of stress and displacement of *r* in *întreg*<*integru*, where *r* has kept *e* from becoming *ie*.

The sound *l* may, like *r*, undergo displacement. It is put next to *t*, if one is near it, as *paltin*<*platanu*, *pătlagină*<*plantagine*. Otherwise it passes toward the beginning of the word, as *chiag*<**clagnu*<*coagulu*, *plop*<*pöpulu*. In accordance with this principle the word *pleoapă* has initial *pl*.

The sound *l* is so much like *r* that it may cause its elimination. In *ciur*<*cribru*, *fereastă*<*fereastră*<*fenestra*, *preste*<*prespre*<*per-super*, one *r* has caused the other to disappear by eliminative dissimilation. The same result is due to *l* in *altă*<*altera*, and in *pleoapă*<*palpebra*.

In *preste* for older *prespre*, *t* was formed by dissimilation. In the derivativ of *palpebra*, *p* underwent dissimilation, tho of a different kind: *p...p...b* became *p...b...p*. For such interchange of voiced and voiceless sounds, compare Italian *bontade*, *contrada*, *strada*, beside normal *-ate*<*-ăte*, *-ata*<*-ăta*; and French *fade*<**favde*<**vavde*<*vapidu*, *pigeon*=**pibiōne* for *pipiōne*.

Latin *b* was changed to *v* after a vowel in Rumanian. Thus in the derivativ of *palpebra* the consonants became *pl...v...p*, the *r* being lost as stated above. Before considering the change of *v* to *o*, we must examine the development of the vowels.

After a consonant, Rumanian regularly forms ă (a sound like English *u* in *but*) from pretonic *a*. But if the next vowel is *e*, it may change ă to *e*: *beserecă* < *băserecă* < *basilica*, *femeie* < *familia*, *perechie* < *paricula*. The *e* remains even when the following *e* is altered: *lepădare* < **lepedare* < *lapidare*. Therefore we find *e* in *pleoapă*, altho the strest *e* is lost.

Rumanian replaces strest *e* by *ea* where the next vowel is ă: *creădă* < *crădat*, *întreagă* < *integra*, *neagră* < *nigra*, beside *cred* < *crēdo*, *întreg* < *integru*, *negru* < *nigru*. But after a labial we find *a* insted of *ea*: *masă* < *mēnsa*, *pară* < *pira*, *vază* < *videat*. In accordance with this, *pleoapă* < **plevapă* has strest *a* for original *e*. The final ă is normal, after a consonant.

In Portuguese, stressless *e* (<*i* and *e*) is generally sounded as *i* or an *i*-like vowel; and stressless *o* (<*u* and *o*) is regularly sounded as *u*. Likewise in Rumanian we find *i* < *e* < *i*: *biserică* < *beserecă* < *băserecă* < *basilica*, *lacrimă* < **lacremă* (whence the variant *lacramă* with normal ă for *e* after *r*) < *lacrima*. These analogies allow us to assume *u* < *o* < *u* in cases like *altul* < **altrolo* < *alteru'llu*, *negru* < **negro* < *nigru*. In two words we find *o* < *u*, preservd by passiv assimilation, or by variable stress. One of these is *popor*, now strest on the second vowel, as explaind below. The other is *acoló* (now also *acólo*) < **accu'lloc*, in which the ferst element, apparently *eccu* modified by *hăc*, is the same as that of *acum* < **accu-modo*. Both *o* and *u* ar found as stressless representativs of Greek *upsilon* in *preot* and *preut* 'priest,' *martor* and *martur* 'witness.' Likewise Rumanian *au* < *au* seems to hav past thru *ao*. In the derivativ of *adauget*, written *adauge* in some grammars, Tiktin givs *ao* several times, so that the *o* can hardly be a misprint (*Rumänisches Elementarbuch*, § 231, p. 194). The Banat dialect has *aor*, *graor*, for literary *aur* < *auru*, *graur* < *gra(c)ulu*, according to Popovici, *Recherches expérimentales sur une prononciation roumaine* (*La Parole*, 1903, 233-322).

These few fragments of evidence show that in Rumanian, as in Italian and western Romance, stressless Latin *u* became *o*. We may therefore assume that secondary *u* cood also become *o*. Secondary *u* was formd from *b* after a vowel; also from Latin *v* (the semivowel *u*) in the same position, if we suppose that this

sound followd the usual Romance development in Rumanian. When the derivativ of *b* or *v* stood between vowels, it was generally assimilated and absorbd, as *cal*<*caballu*, *nuär*<*nübilu*, *scrie*<*scribit*. This development is regularly found where the two vowels were the same or nearly alike (*e..i* or *i..e*); also where one of them was strest and labial, and usually where the second was stressless. Where the second was strest and unlike the ferst, we find a trace of the original consonant: *avere*<*habere*, *luare*<*levare*. The latter seems to hav past thru **loare*<**leoare*<**leuare*, the stressless *e* being assimilated to *o*; while in *treerare*<**treorare*<*tribulare* the reverse change took place, because the *e* was haf-strest.

If we admit that *o* was the regular derivativ of *b* and *v* between vowels, or at least between open vowels (Rumanian *a, e, ă, o*), the whole development of *pleoapă*<**plevapă*<*palpebra* may be cald normal. The order of the various changes is not clear; it may hav been as follows: **palbepra*, **palbrepa*, **palbepa*, **plabepa*, **plăvepă*, **plevepă* (or **pleveapă*), **plevapă*, **pleuapă*. The final difference between *pleoapă* and *luare*<**leoare* can be explained in three ways.

The utterance of the consonant-groop *pl* reqwires more effort than simple *l*; hence the ferst sillable may hav had a slihtly greater stress in *pleoapă* than in **leoare*, and thus kept *e* unchanged.

In the Hispanic tungs, Latin intervocalic *d* was often lost: Portuguese *crê*, Spanish *cree*<*crédit*, Port. *ninho*<**nio* (but Span. *nido*)<*nídu*. At a much later period the verb-ending *-des* commonly lost *d* after a vowel: *deis*<*dedes*<*dētis*, Span. *veis* (but Port. *vêdes*)<*veedes*<*vidētis*. In spoken Spanish the loss of *d* is now going on, as *estado*>*estao*. Hence it is possible that **leoare* and *pleoapă* were formd at different times, and that **plevapă* lost *v* too late for its vowels to be assimilated.

Rumanian forms *oa*<*o* under the same conditions as *ea*<*e*. Altho *ea* and *oa* now rime with *a*, it seems probable that the stress was at ferst *ea, oa*. These wood naturally become *eă* and *oă* later, with the stress on the opener vowel as in the general Romance development of *filiolu*, *muliere*. The stress *oa* was usual in the seventeenth century, if we can trust the texts given by Tiktin; these make sistematic use of accents, and regularly hav medial *oa*, beside an

initial *óá* with the stress-mark displaced because of the breathing (*Rumänisches Elementarbuch*, p. 189). If we assume the stress *óá* (<*o*) for the time when *o* was developt in *pleoapă*, the countless cases of *óá* wood hav produced *óá* in this word. But in the various forms of the verb **leoare*, strest *a* had a grammatic meaning and was kept strest by the influence of all the other *a*-verbs. Thus the two cases ceast to be parallel and developt differently; the two stressless vowels of **leoare* were contracted to *o*, which became *u* before the original stress was restored in *pleoapă*.

If the stress-displacement *vá>óá* once existed in *pleoapă*, it is paralleld by an eqwally remarkable change that occurrd in *popor*.

Popor, 'folk.'

Popor seems to be connected with Latin *populu*, but its stress is on the second *o*. For this reason Tiktin says the origin of the word is "?" (*Rumänisches Elementarbuch*, p. 215). The stress may be explaind as a case of assimilation. Rumanian has another noun meaning 'folk,' with the same inflection, the same vowels and the same stress as *popor*, namely *norod*, of Slavonic origin. It can scarcely be doubted that the stress of *popór* is due to the influence of *noród*. If this is admitted, the rest of the development is not hard to understand.

Latin *singulu* makes Rumanian *singur*, so that we miht expect **popur* from *populu*. But as shown above, Latin stressless *u* past thru *o* before reaching Rumanian *u*. Therefore the erly form was **popolo* or **poporo*. The final *o* became *u* as usual, and is dropt in modern Rumanian unless protected by an enclitic (*poporul<popolu'llu*). As the medial *o* had no such inflectional value, it escaped the general change of stressless *o* to *u*. It may hav done this because of passiv assimilation, which cood preserv stem-vowels but not inflections. Passiv assimilation, whereby one vowel keeps another from changing, is common in connection with the development of *ă* from *e* after a labial; this occurs when no palatal vowel follows: *numără<numerat* but *numere<numeret*, *păr<piru* but *pere=pirae*. In the following table, which shows how passiv assimilation may hav acted, unsettled stress is indicated by two accents.

classic Latin	<i>eccum illoc formōsum populum</i>		
late Latin	<i>*acolō</i>	<i>*formoso</i>	<i>*popolo</i>
medieval	<i>*acolō</i>	<i>*fromosu</i>	<i>*póporu</i>
early Rumanian	<i>acólō</i>	<i>frumosu</i>	<i>*póporu</i>
modern Rumanian	<i>acólō</i>	<i>frumosu</i>	<i>popóru</i>

Sl. *narodū***narodu*

The assimilation of *ă* to *o* is normal in *norod*, being found in other words of Latin and Slavonic origin.

E. H. TUTTLE

NEW HAVEN, CONNECTICUT

A BIBLIOGRAPHICAL GHOST: THE DEVENTER PETRARCH OF 1494

For nearly a century and a half, there has been more or less speculation as to the existence of a Dutch edition of Petrarch's *Opera* of the year 1494. Reference to this edition may be found (to mention only a few of the most important bibliographers) in Hain, 12747; in Panzer, I, 362 [in Jansen, 319]; in Campbell, 391; in Visser, X, 39.¹ All these citations go back to a common source: Maittaire, *Annales Typographici*, 1719-1741, V, pt. II, p. 544. The failure of booksellers and cataloguers ever to discover any such edition has led scholars, as for example Hortis, to suspect some error of printing or observation behind Maittaire's reference. This guess in all its vagueness has in turn been taken up by a long series of bibliographers. We find in Professor Robinson's article a scientific statement of the situation, in a return to the original citation in Maittaire.² At any rate, this ghost of Deventer has so persistently beset bibliographers and students of Petrarch and of incunabula in general, that we are tempted to take this opportunity of consigning it to a much deserved repose. The story is one of errors in compilation, not without a certain intricacy and interest.

The first serious attempt to wrestle with the problem was in the *Catalogue of Petrarch Books* (Ithaca, N. Y., 1882) of Professor Fiske, who very cleverly suggested that the original error

¹ Visser, *Naamlyst van Boeken*, Amsterdam, 1787; Campbell, *Typographie Néerlandaise*, La Haye, 1874.

² Petrarch's *Confessions*, in this review, vol. I, p. 232, note 1.

proceeded from the following passage in Maittaire, I, pt. II, p. 787:

F. Petrarchæ Opera. fo. Basil. 1494.

Liber metricus Faceti Morosi. 40. Davent. 1494;

with the comment: "The whole story if this supposed Deventer edition may have originated in a careless reading (by either Visser or Panzer or both) of the following lines occurring in one of Maittaire's lists." Now, Visser at this time was not accessible to Professor Fiske, though he afterwards added this valuable book to his Petrarch collection. But Panzer's reference was justly suspicious to him for the following reason: Panzer misprinted the correct reference to Maittaire: II, p. 544, instead of vol. V, pt. II, p. 544. Not being able to discover this citation in Maittaire, Professor Fiske was led to believe that the latter never made such a reference; so that his brilliant guess itself remained an hypothesis, based of course on false premises.

No one apparently has thought of comparing the citation in Maittaire I, pt. II, 787, with that in V, pt. II, 544; nor of noticing the nature of the first citation. It occurs in a list which Maittaire entitles: "Catalogus librorum quos a Viro Cl. PM. mecum serius paulò communicatos suis locis inserere, prælo me diutius morantem urgente, non licuit." So that one would expect either that in succeeding volumes (this one was published in 1733) this edition of Petrarch would be noted in its proper place, or at least that it would figure in Maittaire's index. And sure enough, the mention of the Deventer edition in V, II, 544, refers back by page number to the "F. Petrarchæ Opera, Basil. 1494" of the first citation. Whereby it becomes clear that the references are actually one and the same, and that Professor Fiske's hypothesis is the true one. That is, in a moment of distraction, either Maittaire or his printers or his copyists reproduced the place reference of the work immediately below the *Basil.* of the Petrarch edition. *Unde tanti labores.*

The early failure to detect the slip is doubtless to be explained by the great gap that intervened between the publication of the parts of Maittaire's work. Some libraries (e. g., Cornell and Columbia) have only vols. I-III; others may have possessed only IV

and V. But the main responsibility for the perpetuation of the error rests with Panzer, who had both citations before him.³

ARTHUR LIVINGSTON

CORNELL UNIVERSITY

A MENTION OF THE RETURN OF KING ARTHUR IN
FOUCON DE CANDIE

THE following passage is to be added to the large number that mention the awaiting of the return of King Arthur.¹ It is cited from *Foucon de Candie*, MS. 774 of the Bibliothèque Nationale, fol. 138 r°. The Saracens are holding a council of war. A leader says of the French warriors that they will not go away:

Ne s'en torneront mes ainz auront blé meür,
Se tant volez atendre com Breton font Artur;
Mes pendons nos escuz as batailles du mur,
Et movons enquenuit quant plus fera oscur,
Si ralons veir Cordes et la terre Fabur.

Compare this passage with another typical one from *Garin le Lorrain*, quoted by Ferdinand Lot in *Etudes Historiques du Moyen Age dédiées à G. Monod*, 1896, p. 211:

Nous sommes viex et chenu et flori,
La soie grace nous vaura moult petit,
Com as Bretons qui desirent toudis
Le roi Artu, qu'est dou siecle partis.

RAYMOND WEEKS

¹The verification of the reference in V in the Lenox library, I owe to my good friend Mr. Rudolph Altrocchi, of Columbia University.

²See R. H. Fletcher: *The Arthurian Material in the Chronicles, especially those of Great Britain and France*, in *Studies and Notes in Philology and Literature*, Ginn & Co., Boston, vol. X, 1906, pp. 100-107, 120, 138, 143, 146, 165, 167, 188, 197, 202, 207, 219-223, 232, 239. Also, by the same author, *Publications of the Modern Language Association*, vol. XVIII, pp. 87, 94.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

Les Obres del Elegantissim y Genial Poeta del Amor, Ausias March. Ara per quarta vegada estampades, durant lo glorios Renaximent de les Lletres Catalanes. Barcelona. A despeses de N'Alvar Verdaguer. MCMIX, pp. 438.

This reprint of the works of Ausias March, issued in 2500 copies in ordinary paper, and 200 in fine linen paper, consists of the text of the poems, a glossary, two appendices of bibliographical notes, an index of authors mentioned, and additions. While we may welcome this volume as a new proof of the devoted interest shown by the Catalans in their literary past, we must say at once that it is unsatisfactory in every other respect. The editor, whose name appears nowhere in the volume, leaves us in ignorance both in regard to the object of his edition and the principles underlying his work. With a single and unimportant exception, however, the text of the publication proves to be an uncritical reproduction of the editions of 1864, 1884 and 1888 which, as is well known, in their turn are mere reprints of the older editions of the sixteenth century (the Library of the Hispanic Society of America, it may be said in passing, possessing those of 1539, 1543, 1555, 1560, 1562, 1579). None of the thirteen manuscripts in which the works of Ausias March are now extant, and the most complete of which, dating probably from 1542-1543, is accessible in the National Library at Madrid (no. 2985, cf. Pagès, *Romania* 36, 207), nor the investigations of recent critics have been consulted by the editor, as may be seen from a few typical cases. The *endrega* of no. ii of the *Cants de Mort* is omitted in the present edition (p. 228) as in its precursors, though the editor's distinguished countryman Milà y Fontanals in 1865 (*Obras*, iii, p. 186) had called attention to the fact that it contained the name of the person to whom the poem is addressed, Antoni Tallander, also called Mossen Borrà, the clown of Alphonse V of Aragon, to whose old age the Castilian Villasandino alludes in a poem composed as early as 1412 (*Canc. de Baena*, no. 65, st. 8). In no. ii of the *Estramps* (*Qui de per si ne per Deu virtuts uso*), stanza 27 (p. 319 of the present edition), we still read: *no contra fa la taula de Perusa*, though Pagès in the article above referred to (p. 211) shows that we have in this passage a reference to the Eugubine Tables discovered in 1444, and that the correct reading must be: *no contrafa la taula de Peruça*. . . . The Glossary, in which proper names are also included, while needlessly registering a host of well-known words and verbal forms such as *abrasa*, *absenta*, *consegre*, *Aristotil*, *Bachus*, etc., omits some very important and less familiar ones. Such is the case with *Far* in the phrase *Deçà lo Far* (p. 176) referring to the light-house of Valencia (see Pagès, ib., p. 215), *Perusa* (*Peruça* = *Perugia*), the oft-recurring *senyals* of the poet's mistress, *Lir entre carts* (Lily among Thistles), *Planch de seny*, and *seguida*, a metrical term used in the sense of *endrega* (as p. 178, 213, 309) of which the present writer will have occasion to speak elsewhere. The Bibliography is scarcely more satisfactory than the other parts of the work under review. Besides lacking in critical arrangement, it is made up of a good deal of insignificant matter in

place of which one would like to see, among other things, a mention of such important manuscripts as the one cited above (no. 2985, also omitted by Massó Torrents in his Catalogue of Catalan Manuscripts found in the National Library at Madrid), the *Cancionero Catalan de la Universidad de Zaragoza* (published in 1896 with the exception of the poems of Auzias March) and the *Cançoner de obres enamorades* (no. 595 of the *fonds espagnol*) of the Paris Library, which Mr. H. C. Heaton is preparing to edit. It is to be hoped that Amédée Pagès will in the near future redeem his promise, made a long time ago, of giving the student of Catalan literature a critical edition of the works of the Valençian singer.

H. R. LANG.

Les Jongleurs en France au Moyen Age. Par EDMOND FARAL (187^e fascicule de la Bibliothèque des Hautes Etudes). Paris, H. Champion, 1910. Pp. x + 339.

The volume of Mr. Faral is dedicated to Joseph Bédier, and is worthy of its dedication. The author proves himself a scholar of high competence. He indicates that he has made a genuine and first-hand study of the medieval poets, tracing his way thru multiple obstacles, and attaining conclusions which appear sane and sound. In several cases, a fresh aspect of some literary genre makes itself felt from his careful investigations. While it may be said that a number of grave questions connected with his subject remain unsettled, the fact stands that there is no chapter in his work which is lacking in actual interest, or which seems superficial.

Before offering a brief analysis of the first part of Mr. Faral's study, I beg to commence by drawing attention to Appendix III, which provides in chronological order a vast series of Latin and French documents bearing witness to the life and condition of the jongleurs. This list in itself is "worth the price of the volume" for the light it sheds on medieval popular literature, and on the usage of the Latin *joculator*, the French *Jongleur*, and equivalent terms. In English literature, the *geoglere*, *juggler* (cf. Shakespeare: "nimble jugglers that deceive the eye") seems never to have rivalled with the nobler *minstrel*, but rather to have corresponded to the German *Gawbler*. In the first part of his treatise, Mr. Faral fails to establish a neat distinction between *jongleur* and *ménestrel*, and he suffers later from this lack, for he is guilty of virtual anachronisms in his use of these words. He may have been led to this from considerations of style. In any event, he applies at times the word *ménestrel* too early: pp. 62, 78. Again, in the chapter on Rutebeuf, the author's employment of *ménestrel* causes him to assume at times an awkward attitude.

An idea of the charm and interest of the book may be obtained from the titles of three chapters of the first part: I: *Origine des Jongleurs*; II: *L'Eglise contre les Jongleurs*; III: *L'Eglise favorise certains Jongleurs*. According to Mr. Faral, the jongleur descends directly from the Roman *mimus*.¹ His argument appears perfectly defensible, tho it places him in direct opposition to the views of Gaston Paris, who said: ". . . de bonne heure, il y eut une classe spéciale de poètes et d'exécutants. Ces hommes, héritiers en partie des *scōpas* francs, s'appelèrent en français *joglers*." In view of the dedication of his

¹ Cf. the interesting studies by P. S. Allen, appearing in *Modern Philology*.

volume, it is needless to state that Mr. Faral sides with the author of the *Légendes Épiques*, and looks with disfavor on the ancient theory of epic evolution as formerly proposed by G. Paris and P. Rajna.

Chapter II contains precious remarks on the legend of Golias² (we wonder that Villon's name nowhere occurs here). The third chapter discusses the famous Latin charter of Thomas Cabham, the English clerk of the close of the 13th century. This is the document to which Guessard and L. Gautier attach such importance. M. Faral professes to regard the document more lightly, yet he is under its influence, and cites more than once its concluding words: "Sunt autem alii, qui dicuntur joculatores, qui cantant gesta principum et vitam sanc-torum, et faciunt solacia hominibus," etc. (the entire charter or penitential is quoted in the note on p. 67). Mr. Faral neglects to comment on the term *joculator*, which, in the document, certainly appears to possess some dignity.

The second part of the book: *Le Règne des Jongleurs*, makes instructive and delightful reading. His first chapter of part second offers a classification of the jongleurs: he himself feels that the title he has chosen for this chapter is perhaps not "tout à fait rigoureuse, mais elle a une réelle valeur explicative." The next two chapters bring most interesting information concerning the *Jongleurs et le Peuple*, and the *Jongleurs aux Cours seigneuriales*. The fourth chapter: *Les Ménestrels*, has already been slightly criticised at the beginning of this review. Mr. Faral cites here Jouplet and Pinçonnet as types of the minstrel, whilst Rutebeuf (Chapter VIII) figures as the type of the jongleur. The author finds necessary to defend somewhat his choice of Rutebeuf for this rôle. His defence is ingenious, and shows a real insight into and sympathy for the character of Rutebeuf.

With chapter IX: *Les Jongleurs et les Genres littéraires*, we arrive at what may be called the quintessence of the book. The vast and profound knowledge of the author enables him to offer here more than one new perspective. His chief attention, of course, is claimed by the chansons de geste. He insists on separating the names of the known writers of chansons de geste into two categories: *jongleurs* and *ménestrels*. If we feel that this division merits some censure, we cannot refrain from approving the skill he shows in placing the lives of the saints on one side, as counterparts to the strictly epic poetry. Again, he considers the *lais et romans bretons* as the work of the *ménestrels*, and the *fabliaux* as mainly that of the *jongleurs*. On pp. 211-13, the author considers the contributions of the jongleurs to history and to dramatic literature.

The third part of the work is devoted to the darker period of the decadence of the jongleurs. Even here, says Mr. Faral, the jongleurs "restent les maîtres du genre comique." Students of the drama will note in this part the originality of the author, who does not agree with the views, for example, of Petit de Julleville, but rather maintains the co-existence of two separate currents, one serious, the other comic. He denies the possibility of the development of an inherent comical element in the *Mystères*. The conclusions of the author are most startling as seen in his final chapter: *Les Jongleurs, le Mime et le Théâtre régulier* (pp. 231-51). He notes and explains every step which was taken by the dramatic muse. Mr. Faral leads his reader to the juvenile spectacle of the *danse mimique*, examines with him the musical ensemble of medieval literature,

² A valuable article, entitled *Familia Goliae*, was published by John M. Manley, in *Modern Philology*, V, pp. 201-09.

passes thru the intermediate dramatic monolog to the dialog performed at first by one and the same actor.* The author shows in convincing manner that, when the regular stage is reached, the jongleur recedes more and more from view, his name deteriorates in dignity, yet his influence persists in the farce. While Petit de Julleville asserted that no relation whatever existed between the jongleur and the modern *comédien*, Mr. Faral is of the opinion that: "les comédiens du XV^e siècle sont les descendants directs des jongleurs." He firmly believes in a genuine tradition which runs from the Middle Ages to Molière. The immortal poet did not hesitate to make vigorous use of the patrimony of the ancient jongleurs.

While the critic may not agree with all of the new and, at times, startling views of Mr. Faral, he cannot help feeling that they must henceforth be reckoned with by every serious student of medieval literature. It will require a great fund of knowledge and no small amount of courage for one to attack the author's conclusions.

M. J. MINCKWITZ

MUNICH

La Difunta Pleiteada, Estudio de Literatura Comparativa. Por MARÍA GOYRI DE MENÉNDEZ PIDAL. Madrid, Librería General de v. Suárez, 1909. 8°, 70 pp.

In the days of the Renaissance, women played a part in the academic life of Spain. When the famous humanist Nebrija was unable to conduct his classes, his daughter is said to have taken his place and to have represented him worthily. An equally charming example of the Spanish woman's co-operation in scholarly matters, within the domestic and academic circles, appears in our own days in the case of Sra. María Goyri de Menéndez Pidal, the wife of the clever philologist of the University of Madrid. She has recently published an interesting treatise within the domain of Comparative Literature, in which she discusses the history of a theme important because of its treatment in two Spanish plays of the Classic period, and in the Spanish tale and ballad. In the ballad form it is common to all three of the peninsular languages, Spanish, Portuguese and Catalan.

The theme in question has three chief elements: (1) a wife is buried as dead; (2) she is saved from her living tomb by a lover, who had had a promise of marriage from her before her father compelled her to marry the other man; (3) with this other man (the husband) the lover has now a lawsuit (or dispute) for the possession of her. It is obvious that in the first two elements the theme has certain relations to that of Romeo and Juliet.

For Sra. Goyri de Menéndez Pidal the ballad treatment, presenting factors apparently primitive, is properly the objective point of study. She refers to or prints variants of the ballad found all over the peninsula, and then, analyzing the traits common to them all, seeks to make clear the essential elements of the original ballad. This she discovers to be as follows: Doña Ángela (the name varies), the fairest woman of her time, is wooed by many men of high degree. Among them all she prefers Don Juan de Castilla and they plight their mutual

* Mr. Faral has treated this last literary genre in a separate monograf of value: *Mimes Français du XIII^e Siècle*, Paris, Champion, 1910.

troth. But the maiden's father, desirous of marrying her off advantageously, promises her to a rich merchant of Seville (or some other place), and Don Juan, learning of this, goes off to the Indies (or to Perpignan) to try to forget her. During his absence the marriage occurs, but the bride dies on the wedding-day. At the end of nine months (the time varies, extending even to seven years), Don Juan returns and, passing before the house of his beloved, sees at the window a young girl dressed in mourning and from her learns of the death of his beloved and the place of her burial. He runs to her tomb and, with the aid of a hermit (or sacristan) whom he enlists in his service, raises the flagstone over it. He finds the buried woman as fair as when she was alive. Overcome by grief, he is about to stab himself on the spot, but the Virgin, to whom he has always been devoted, stays his arm and revives Doña Ángela. As the lovers go forth from the church they encounter the merchant (this trait is in only two of the variants), who demands his wife. The lover refuses to give her up and a suit is started in the chancery of Granada (or Rome, or Valladolid), the outcome of which is favorable to Don Juan.

For this story of the ballad form Sra. Goyri de Menéndez Pidal finds a truly Spanish historical germ in an event in the life of an authentic Don Juan de Castilla of Madrid, who lived in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries. During his absence from home, his wife was buried as dead, and some time afterward it was found that she had revived in the tomb, only to die a real and more awful death. But this historical occurrence had none of the novelesque traits of the visit to the tomb by the lover and of the subsequent suit (or dispute). However, we find all the important traits combined in an account of two lovers of Burgos, given as historical by Luis Zapata, in his *Miscelánea* of about 1500. Zapata is far from being a trustworthy historian and the chances are that he relates as real what he derives only from fictionary sources (and, in particular, from the ballad), for he cites only an unknown version as his informant.

For Sra. Goyri de Menéndez Pidal the dénouement of the ballad is a mere variant of a novelesque theme which is widely diffused. The fundamental element in the dénouement is the suit (or dispute). This is found in Oriental tales, e. g., in the *Tuti-Nameh*. In the Occident we see the theme of the buried woman used twice by Boccaccio, viz., in a story in the *Filocolo* and in the *Decameron*, IV, 10. Although the outcome differs in these tales of Boccaccio from that which prevails in the Spanish traditions, still they possess the essential features of the latter: the lover removing from the tomb the beloved woman and then disputing (debating) with her husband. This particular feature, it must be said, is somewhat disguised by Boccaccio.

Dismissing from detailed consideration—as not having the feature of the suit (dispute), which the authoress stresses particularly—the Romeo and Juliet story of the Italian *novellieri* Massuccio Salernitano, Luigi da Porto and Bandello, and of the playwrights Lope de Vega (*Castelvines y Monteses*) and Shakspere, as well as a tale of the Italian Giraldi Cinthio and legends recorded by Child for Servian, Russian and Turkish territory, she passes in review other accounts which present closer analogies. One of these is the Italian poem (15th and 16th centuries) *Ginebra degli Almieri*, studied by Rajna (*Romania*, XXXI). This lacks, in its extant form, the incident of the lover's visit to the tomb, but Sra. Goyri de Menéndez Pidal gives a good reason for supposing that an earlier

Italian form of the story had it. All the traditional elements are brought together, although not with the same arrangement as in the Spanish ballad, by Bandello (*Novelle*, II, 41) in his story of Gerardo and Elena, which he declares to be based on fact, and this story provided the plot for the Spanish play, *La difunta pleitada*, whence comes the title of the present treatise. Like La Barrera and Chorley, Sra. Goyri de Menéndez Pidal regards this drama—often attributed to Rojas y Zorrilla—as one of Lope de Vega's and gives more valid reasons for her contention than had been done by those critics. She also makes quite plausible the argument that the *Varios prodigios de amor* of Rojas, which also treats our tradition, is only an elaboration of Lope's piece. From Bandello's tale, furthermore, there was derived the story of Camilo and Lucrecia told in prose by the Spaniard Matrás de los Reyes in his *Menandro* (printed in 1636). Thus it is that we have in Spanish the ballad, two plays and a prose tale, as well as the account given by Zapata, all of which develop the same matter, and the plays and the tale hark back to Bandello. Now it has been stated by Miss Bourland (*Revue hispanique*, XII) that the Spanish ballad came directly from Bandello. From this view Sra. Goyri de Menéndez Pidal dissents. She thinks that the ballad and Zapata's account represent one and the same version and that this is independent of Bandello. "The close resemblance," she says, "discoverable between both proceeds from the fact that these two accounts are those most faithful to the popular tradition. Thus, both contain combined the three essential traits which are isolated in the other versions: (1) They preserve the promise of the lady to marry the man who takes her from the tomb . . . , (2) the visit of the lover to the lady's tomb . . . , (3) the final suit (dispute) The Spanish ballad is, among all these versions known to me, the one most faithful to all the traditional elements. It is probably anterior to Bandello. The case of the wife of Don Juan de Castilla, buried alive in Santo Domingo, called forth this versified redaction of an old theme which, in the form of a tale, may have been current in the tradition of the Peninsula."

It is to be noted that Sra. Goyri de Menéndez Pidal qualifies her statement with regard to the relative dates of the ballad and Bandello's story. This shows commendable prudence, for Bandello's influence in the Spanish peninsula was, in all probability, rather large, and it has not yet been subjected to the research that it demands. A monograph on the subject is much needed. When dealing with Zapata, she mentions the fact that he knows of a happening declared by him to have occurred at Florence, and this happening is like in its nature the story which he recounts of the lovers of Burgos, to which he prefaces it. The tale of what happened in Florence she believes him to have obtained from oral tradition. She may be right. Certainly Zapata's account of the Florentine event varies much from Bandello's story in its details and result, but, as she herself seems to imply (p. 50 f.), Zapata's Florentine story accords in many ways with the Italian *Ginevra* story. The real relation of Zapata to the *Ginevra* could hardly be investigated with profit, because Zapata's account of the Florentine event is extremely brief. Were it possible to examine more fully into it, we might find that the ballad, if it owes nothing to Bandello, at least is of ultimately Italian origin. But all this is only speculation.

Taking all in all, Sra. Goyri de Menéndez Pidal shows herself to be a scholar with a strong grasp of leading facts, which she states clearly and upon

which she bases solid arguments. On this account we have deemed it well worth while to set forth at length the nature and contents of her treatise.

J. D. M. FORD

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

Oeuvres Poétiques. A. HÉROET. Edition critique, publiée par F. Gohin. Paris, E. Cornély, 1910.

An excellent edition. The biographical notice with which the volume opens adds little to what was already known of the poet's life. Of a serious, reflective nature, Héroet, unlike the greater part of Renaissance writers, left behind no information concerning himself or his ancestors. Born about 1492, at Paris, of an "ancient and illustrious family" (his father, Jean Héroet, was the treasurer of Louis XII), he perhaps studied in his native city, devoting his attention especially to philosophy, and to Plato in particular. In 1524 he was a pensioner of Marguerite de Navarre. His epitaph of Louise de Savoie was written in 1531, the *Blason de l'œil* in 1535, the *Androgynie de Platon* as early as 1536, and *la Parfaite Amye*, his best known work, was published in 1542. By this time Héroet had become a conspicuous figure in court and literary circles, the friend of Clément Marot, Mellin de Saint-Gelais, and perhaps of Etienne Dolet and Rabelais. Not later than 1543 he took holy orders, and in 1552, thanks doubtless to the influence of his relative François Olivier, Chancellor of France, became Bishop of Digne (Basses-Alpes), which position he held until his death in 1568.

M. Gohin's bibliography of Héroet's works is carefully compiled, stress being placed on the importance of the two editions from the press of Etienne Dolet (1542, 1543), perhaps the only ones published with the author's sanction.

The text of Héroet's principal poems (*la Parfaite Amye*, *l'Androgynie de Platon*, *Aultre invention extraictte de Platon*, and *Complaincte d'une dame surprise nouvellement d'amour*) is reproduced from the first edition: *La Parfaite Amye, Nouuellement composée par Antoine Héroet, dict la Maison neuve. Avec autres compositions dudit Auteur. A Lyon, Chés Estienne Dolet. 1542.* Variants and a reproduction of the original title page are given. M. Gohin is to be commended for his liberal citing of passages from Castiglione's *Cortegiano* and Plato's works, and for emphasizing the influence of the *Cortegiano* (particularly the portion that deals with woman and love) not only on Héroet, but on other writers of the period.

To the volume printed by Dolet, the editor adds seventeen *Poésies diverses*, among which are to be noted epitaphs of Louise de Savoie and Marguerite de Navarre, the *Blason de l'œil*, Héroet's contribution to the *Blasons des parties du corps féminin*, *l'Amour de Cupido et de Psyché*, written in collaboration with Claude Chappuys and Mellin de Saint-Gelais, *Douleur et Volupté*, long attributed to Clément Marot, *l'Honneur des femmes*, and several quatrains, huitains, rondeaux, etc. Guillaume Colletet's manuscript notice on Héroet and a glossary complete the volume.

Héroet's high position in the French Renaissance has been won by the platonism of a single poem, *la Parfaite Amye*, although several others, *l'Androgynie de Platon*, *Complaincte d'une dame . . .*, and *Douleur et Volupté* also show more or less platonic influence. M. Gohin rightly devotes a good part of his *Notice biographique* to a consideration of Héroet's masterpiece, which he calls "le grand

œuvre de l'école de Marot." But would he not have done better had he given the reader a clear idea as to the exact nature of the platonism of the *Parfaict Amye*, "which owes much to the Italian humanists"? Some of the ideas advanced by Héroet are subtle in the extreme, hence a lucid, comprehensive statement of them in the introduction, with a word as to their origin, is more than desirable.

In order to emphasize Héroet's importance, M. Gohin should have given a brief summary of the slow but constant spread of platonism in France prior to the efforts of Marguerite de Navarre and Héroet; then the rôle played by the latter would have stood out more strongly, and even the casual reader could see why Héroet must be considered one of the chief precursors of the Pleiad.

For the sake of comparison the passage from the *Symposium* on which the *Androgyne de Platon* is based should have been given in a footnote.

And finally, mention should have been made of an excellent synopsis of the *Parfaict Amye* by W. A. R. Kerr in the *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*, vol. 20, pp. 567-583.

R. L. HAWKINS

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

Jacques Peletier du Mans (1517-1582), Essai sur sa vie, son œuvre et son influence. Thèse présentée à la Faculté des Lettres de Caen. Par l'ABBÉ CLÉMENT JUGÉ. Paris, 1907. Pp. xv + 449.

When we consider the varied activities of Jacques Peletier, the interesting rôle that he played in the literary history of the sixteenth century, we are not surprised that he has received so much attention in recent years. He devoted his early youth to the study of law, but his passion for Greek and the poetry of Marot soon convinced him that literature was his real field. As secretary of René du Bellay, he made the acquaintance of the young Joachim and his friend Ronsard, and discussed with them many of the doctrines that were later to form a prominent part of the *Defence et Illustration*. We next find him as principal of the Collège de Bayeux, but the teaching profession—although he was forced to it in later life—never appealed to him. Nevertheless, his pedagogical theories are original and interesting. His mathematical text-books enjoyed wide popularity throughout the century. But his remarkable mind, ever on the alert for new problems to solve, soon led him into other fields. One might say that Peletier is a typical representative of the spirit of the times. That unsettled century, rent in twain by religious wars and philosophical discussions, abounded in original scholars who foresaw the necessity of establishing all learning on a scientific basis. We are often inclined to consider comparative grammar as one of the distinctly modern sciences. And yet several comparative grammars, especially of the Semitic languages, were published during the sixteenth century. From mathematics Peletier turned to medicine, and began to revolutionize that science, still encumbered with the puerile theories of the past. While engrossed in the study of this subject, he yet found the time to delve into the mysteries of reformed spelling. He entered into this famous discussion, which lasted for several years, with all of the enthusiasm and intensity characteristic of a sixteenth century scholar. Those who agreed with him were his friends, those who dared to differ were his bitter enemies. And it is interesting to note in this regard that the arguments adduced by him and others for and against

reformed spelling, as well as the orthographical changes that he advocated—such as the omission of certain letters, the substitution of *s* for *x*, etc.—are astonishingly similar to those advanced in our own times by Meyer, Brunot, and other eminent scholars. But it was as a poet that Peletier was held in highest esteem by his contemporaries. His verse is not deficient in inspiration and bears the impress of originality. "Il est le docte, le fameux Peletier," says M. Laumonier, "pour du Bellay, Ronsard, Baïf, Montaigne, Pasquier, de Thou et d'autres."¹ We are therefore grateful to Abbé Jugé for having given us the first complete study of the life and work of this interesting personage.

While in its most important features the monograph of Abbé Jugé deserves no little praise, we regret to say that it has some weak points. One fails to see, for example, why he insists upon the fact that his study differs essentially from that of Hauréau.² It is not in this spirit that a scholar should undertake such a work: he should, on the contrary, profit by all that his predecessors have accomplished. Hauréau may not be always a safe guide, but when he says that an edition of the *In Christoporum Clavium de contactu linearum Apologia* appeared at Paris (Guillaume Cavellat) in 1559, it seems that Abbé Jugé, instead of ignoring the statement because the book is not to be found in the libraries of Paris, should at least have attempted to verify it by means of catalogues of other libraries (cf. Graesse, *Trésor*, etc., mentioned below). The same can be said of the editions of the *Demonstrationes tres* (Paris, 1559, 4to), and of the *Dialogue de l'ortografe* (Poitiers, Marnef, 1559, 8vo), both of which our author has omitted. Abbé Jugé appears to accept Hauréau as a biographer, but not as a bibliographer.

As a matter of fact, the bibliography is the most incomplete and unsatisfactory part of this monograph. In no instance does the author give an accurate description of a work of Peletier. He does not even refer to Picot's admirable *Catalogue de la Bibliothèque Rothschild*, which contains careful and minute descriptions of several of his editions. Baudrier's *Bibliographie lyonnaise* is nowhere mentioned, nor has Gesner's *Bibliotheca universalis* been consulted, although it contains mention of a 1549 edition of the *Annotationes in arithmeticam Gemma Frisii* (Paris, Cavellat), which is not to be found in Abbé Jugé's study. We have said above that our author has limited his researches to the libraries of Paris; hence he is unaware of the existence of the 1554 edition of Peletier's *Arithmétique* (Poitiers, Marnef, 8vo), copies of which are in the libraries of Chaumont and Troyes, and of the 1628 edition of *Les six premiers livres des éléments d'Euclide* (Genève, Jean de Tournes, 8vo), of which a copy is in the library of Chartres.

Other editions of Peletier's works not noted by M. Jugé are: 1. *Les Iliades d'Homere . . . traduict . . . en vers Françoy, par M. H. Salel . . . Avec le Premier et Second de l'Odissee d'Homere, par J. Peletier, etc., 1570, etc., 8vo, Brit. Mus. 11315 aaa2; 2. Les XXIV livres de l'Iliade d'Homere . . . traduict . . . par M. H. Salel . . . et . . . A. Jamyn . . . Avec le premier et second de l'Odyssée par J. Peletier, etc., 1580, 12mo, Ibid. 1349a; 3. L'Arithmetique de*

¹ *Oeuvres poétiques de Jacques Peletier du Mans, publiées par Léon Séché et Paul Laumonier*, Paris, 1904, p. ix.

² Cf. Hauréau's study in the *Histoire littéraire du Maine*, Paris, 1876, pp. 35-63.

Jacques Peletier du Mans, départie en quatre livres, ff. 103, Poitiers, 1549, 4to, *Ibid.* 8507, pp. 39. M. J., not knowing of the existence of this copy, states merely that it is "cité par Deschamps et Brunet" (p. iii); 4. *L'Art poétique . . . départi an deus livres*, Lyon, 1555, 8vo, *Ibid.* 1088c39. This edition is mentioned by Hauréau, p. 40; 5. *J. Peletarij . . . Commentarii tres. I. De dimensione circuli. II. De contactu linearum. . . . III. De constitutione horoscopi*, Basileae, 1563, fol., *Ibid.* 531n12(1); 6. *J. Peletarij de conciliacione locorum Galeni*, in *H. Cardani contradicentium Medicorum libri duo*, etc., 1607, 8vo, *Ibid.* 1169c6; 7. *J. Peletarij De fractionibus astronomicis compendium de cognoscendis per memoriam calendis . . . Arithmeticae practicae methodus facilis*, Huc accesserunt *J. Peletarij . . . annotations*, etc., 1556, 8vo, *Ibid.* 531d6; 8. Another edition, 1576, 8vo, *Ibid.* 8503b13; 9. Another edition, 1578, 8vo, *Ibid.* 531d31(1); 10. Another edition, 1592, 8vo, 531d7(1); 11. *La Savoie*, published in the *Mémoires et Documents de la Société Savoisiennne d'histoire et d'archéologie*, I, 1856, Chambéry. According to M. Mugnier, this is almost a fac-simile edition and contains a "notice de M. Joseph Dessaix sur Peletier et ses ouvrages." Cf. *La Revue de la Renaissance*, 1901, p. 207. Graesse, *Trésor de Livres rares et précieux* (Dresden, 1864, V, p. 188), Viollet Le Duc, *Bibl. poét.* I, 264, etc., and the *Bull. du Bibl.* (1847, July, p. 284 sq.) mention the following editions not noted by M. J.: 1. *Demonstrations III, prima de anguli rectilinei et curvilinei aequalitate. II. De lineae in tres partes continue proportionales sectione. III. de areae trianguli ex numeris aestimatione*, Lugd., 1557, 4to; 2. *In Christophor. Clavium de contactu linearum apologia*, Paris, 1559, 4to; 3. *L'arithmétique départie en quatre livres revue et corrigée*, Poitiers, 1551, 8vo; 4. *Enseignement de vertu, au petit Seigneur Timoleon de Cossé, Lion*, 1554, 16mo.

Turning to the biographical section of this study, we fear that Abbé Jugé is, at times, inclined to emphasize too much the importance of the documentary evidence that he has discovered (cf. p. 13). On p. 11 our author has obviously undervalued the rank of the *imprimeur* in the sixteenth century in considering him as one of the *peuple*. At that time the word *imprimeur*, in its ordinary usage, was synonymous with *libraire*; and many of the publishers were not only scholars, such as Dolet, but of wealthy and aristocratic origin, as, for example, Guillaume Scève, of Lyons, who was, according to M. Buche, "un des correcteurs de l'imprimeur de Sébastien Gryphe."⁸ On p. 23, Abbé Jugé states that about 1543 Peletier "fixe d'une façon définitive son programme de rénovation littéraire," and communicates it to Ronsard and du Bellay, "qui bien plus docilement qu'on ne le supposerait, le repreint dans ses affirmations essentielles." And he does not supply the slightest evidence to support this statement. There is no doubt, as we have said above, that Peletier, like Maurice Scève and many others, was, to a certain extent, a precursor of the *Pléiade*, but that he really composed the *Defence* is hardly tenable. On p. 53, M. Jugé concludes that Peletier did not write the *Enseignement de vertu*, mentioned by du Verdier, Graesse and others (see above), because it is not to be found in the libraries of Paris, and, furthermore, because neither Colletet nor *La Croix du Maine* speaks of it. Stronger evidence than this is necessary to prove that a trustworthy bibliographer like du Verdier is incorrect. The *Messigneurs du Faur*, to whom *Sciance in the Euvres poétiques* (1581) is dedicated, are without doubt the famous Guy du

⁸ *Revue des Langues romanes*, 1896, p. 80.

Faur de Pibrac and Pierre du Faur de St. Jory. A typographical error on p. 124 may cause confusion—viz., “au lieu du *l* ou *p* latin, l’étymologie met un *v* arbitrairement” should read “au lieu du *b* ou *p* latin” etc.

Probably where Abbé Jugé is at his best is in the chapters devoted to Peletier as a poet. His criticisms are usually very judicious. However, it is unfortunate that he should dismiss Buttet, du Coudray, Lambert and Piochet, who are praised by Peletier in his poem on Savoy, with the statement that they are “peu connus ou entièrement obscurs” (p. 252). If he had known of M. Mugnier’s excellent work on *Marc Claude de Buttet* (Paris, 1896), or had consulted any biographical dictionary of Savoy, he would have probably modified his words. In fact, he is unaware of the existence of the exquisite sonnet addressed by Buttet to Peletier, whom the poet calls “divin” and compares to a god. The closing verses are especially beautiful:

Et ainsi que jadis au vieil chantre de Thrace
Les fleuves, et torrens, et pins lui ont fait place,
Et pensant voir un Dieu, se sont émerveillés!

In a very interesting chapter entitled *Peletier, auteur populaire*, Abbé Jugé holds that Prof. Tilley is wrong in attributing the *Joyeux Devis* to Des Périers. He claims, on the contrary, that this well-known work is by Peletier. We do not believe he has proved his point, but lack of space forbids us to analyze his arguments here.

J. L. G.

Nouvelles françaises inédites du Quinzième Siècle. Par ERNEST LANGLOIS.
Paris, H. Champion, 1908. 8vo, pp. xii + 158.

The fifth volume of the *Bibliothèque du XV^e Siècle* contains the hitherto inedited collection of *nouvelles* discovered in MS. 1716 of the Queen Christine collection at the Vatican by Prof. Ernest Langlois of the University of Lille. Prof. Langlois publishes the forty-five chapters comprising the manuscript in a well-edited volume with notes, indications of sources and vocabulary. The author of the collection seems to be an unknown compiler from Lens or its vicinity. Prof. Langlois places the composition in the second half of the fifteenth century, although his arguments are not conclusive. Roughly speaking, the collection may be divided into three groups: light tales on the model of the *Decameron*, pious narratives borrowed for the most part from the *Vie des Pères*, finally a group of religious exhortations and moral sentences. The author was evidently not a literary man, in fact, his fondness for exact numbers and for giving names to even minor characters in his tales shows evidence of a mind childish in its conceptions. Comparison with his sources, when they exist, at once betrays his mediocre talent in reproducing the narrative. Yet one thing must be mentioned in his favor—the rare quality, for his time, of avoiding the vulgar and salacious details common to his contemporaries. The twenty-fourth chapter, *De Herleus, hermite qui confessa Alizonette*, when compared with its original in the *Vie des Pères*, demonstrates the author’s chasteness of thought and simplicity of religious faith. With the exception of a bare half-dozen, none of these *nouvelles* has before been published. Their value to scholars will be considerable in the establishment of lines of relationship between their immediate predecessors and tales composed in later times. Some will be especially

interesting because of their connection with Boccaccio, Sercambi and Rabelais. Prof. Langlois's notes are always stimulating and suggestive.

A. G. PANARONI

COLLEGE OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK

La poesia religiosa di Jacopo Sannazaro. By GIUSEPPE MORPURGO. Ancona, tip. Centrale, 1909. Pp. 73.

The modesty of the author makes this volume quite as inaccessible as the few copies circulated some years ago. That it is a work of youth is to be gathered only from the preface. Nor does the mention of it by Flamini in the *Cinquecento*, nor the brief notice of it elsewhere diminish the value of a summary of it here.

Its major theme is the *De partu Virginis*, studied as an expression of that conflict of nascent paganism, of degenerate superstition, of scientific atheism, of militant Christianity, that constitutes the Italian Reformation. This movement seems to Mr. M. really a beneficent religious awakening (p. 6); we do not know how far he would accept the view which sees in it a resolute turning of Italy toward the past rather than toward the future; nor how far he would explain the pessimism of the Seicento as the work of the Council of Trent. One may still see in this trying epoch and in the way Italy came out of it, the ultimate cause of Custoza, Novara and Aspromonte;—and still be no more in sympathy with the Teutonic Reform than Mr. Santayana.

Mr. M. places the beginning of the poem in 1500 and its completion in 1521 (pp. 9-11); and then outlines the struggle through which Sannazaro passed in perfecting it, a history of minute yet passionate textual criticism, which resulted among other things in abandoning the original title of the poem: *Christiados* (pp. 11-16). The question, posed by Paolo Giovio in 1577, whether with Sannazaro himself and his contemporaries the *De partu Virginis* was considered inferior to the *Ecgloga piscatoria*, Mr. M. leaves in the hypothetical state; but concludes that the author could have had for it the Cardinal's hat; as the Pope, troubled by the chaos in Germany, saw in the poem a turning of the humanists toward the traditional religion. The delay of five years in the publication of the work, Mr. M. attributes to the doubts of Sannazaro as to the perfection of the style; and to his distrust of the printers, who had piqued his pride as a scholar in mutilations of the *Arcadia*;—a preoccupation behind which one notes the seething individualism of the Renaissance, that made of mistaken Latin cases evidence of moral turpitude, and of wrong word-endings a pretext for sword thrusts (pp. 16-19).

The meeting in the poem of Christian vagueness and the concrete splendor of classic form affords Mr. M. occasion for some of that acute esthetic analysis, of which Italians from the composite nature of their cultural inheritance furnish such brilliant examples. In Sannazaro's invocation, the angels are addressed as the inspirers of Christian truth; the Muses, as the guides to poetic ornament: here we have the usual Renaissance conception of poetry as the sweetener of moral teaching. The treatment of the Divinity in book I is too prolix and indefinite to be adequate; but the narration of the events that lead up to the Conception have certain perfect images, quite extraneous to the theme itself. Mary's person is made beautiful by reminiscences of Sannazaro's life beside the sea; but—and Mr. M. winces before his own conclusion with qualms that Carducci would not have felt—"how could the Immaculate Conception rise

to the pure beauty of classic art?" One has only to peruse a few studies of religious poetry to see how far from a platitude this courageous judgment is. The scene where David sings prophetically the life of Christ is an artistic compromise, between the necessity of not ignoring the great facts in the Christian story, and the need of not allowing that narration to become the main theme of the book, which Sannazaro centred around the Birth alone. This portion influenced the Demon chorus in Milton's Hell (pp. 19-29).

The severity of Mr. M.'s criticisms on the second cantica is tempered by a genial and delicate humor. The simple narrative of the Testament becomes ridiculous in the stately metre of Virgil and the pompous ornament of the Renaissance: Joseph arrives at Bethlehem and the inns are crowded: inflamed by the glory of his high mission, in the presence of the Father and mid the whisperings of the Holy Oracles, he goes—to find a boarding house. "Un parto [che] potesse estendersi per tre lunghi libri d'un poema virgiliano... sarebbe, convenitemi, un parto lungo e doloroso." However Mary's approach to her house, with nature bursting into life before her, continues that beautiful popular adoration of woman which stretches onward through literature from Lucretius. So the scene in the manger after the birth recalls the beauty of the famous *Laude* of Leonardo Giustinian. Possibly in his arraignment of the catalogue of the nations, to introduce which the poet makes use of the legend of the Augustan census,¹ Mr. M. had not brought out all that Sannazaro had in mind. We have elsewhere shown how the religious poets of the Renaissance used this traditional device of the epic to emphasize the universality of Christ's mission, as in the *Mondo Nuovo* of Stigliani. But the critic rightly ridicules the mechanical manner in which the matter is introduced; and Sannazaro's painful hesitation as to whether he shall follow Strabo or Pomponius Mela, deciding finally to make the same circle of the Mediterranean which they adopt. In the whole book Virgil seems "suffocated by a mugginess that has an odor of the sacristy" (pp. 29-37).

Mr. M. associates the speech (in the third book) of the Father to the blessed in heaven, recalling the triumphs of the Divine Will over the forces of evil, with the speech of Satan to the Demons, in Milton. In the rest of the poem, inspiration fails completely; and the author has recourse, not without the same hair-splitting preoccupations, to various classic expedients. In proportion as the Christian force weakens, classic images usurp the imagination of the poet, till the whole narrative closes with the appearance of the river god Jordan with a retinue of piquant nymphs: the poet who begins with a dim vision of Christian mystery has ended in a blazing splendor of voluptuous pagan imagery. The anomaly is explained by the current concept of the ancient gods: on the one hand, they stood for general moral abstractions; on the other they suggested brilliant images, capable of being added to any variety of ideas. When Jordan

¹ I note with surprise that Mr. M. cites the authority of Renan's *Vie de Jésus* (which I suppose took on a modern appearance in the Neapolitan translation of 1901), for the statement that the tradition of the census at the time of the Birth is "contradicted by modern criticism." With the date of the Birth itself problematical, the plausibility of Luke's narrative is shown by Nathaniel Schmidt, *The Prophet of Nazareth*, MacMillan, 1905, p. 241; and by Schürer, *Geschichte des Jüdisches Volkes*, Halle, 1901, pp. 508-543.

returns to his river bed again, Sannazaro goes out to take the air; and we are left with a picture of the rocks, the hills, the flowers, the groves of the Neapolitan shore (pp. 37-44). Expressing a general judgment (pp. 44-46), Mr. M. thinks that the *De Partu Virginis* has a double subject, the Birth and the Life, wherein the latter is really used to make up for the poverty of the former as a literary theme; the art of the poet, to atone for the inherent weakness of this composite subject, strove to create a lyric feeling, which however rises only to the pseudo-lyric. The vibration of the author's imagination between classic and Christian matter, shows the weakness of the initial impulse. The poem is still not mediocre, nor yet profound: it is elegant.

The great figure in the poem is not Christ but Virgil, to whose art Sannazaro has not been superior, but to whom the elegance of the verse and concept is due* (pp. 47-49). As a rule in Renaissance Christian poetry, the only personages with relief are those driven by sin; Sannazaro creates no exception to this rule; his characters are sticks and shadows, though that of Mary has a flicker of femininity (pp. 49-50).

Up to 1877, the poem was favored with a score or more of translations of which the best is that of Bartolomeo Casaregi, of 1780. The *De partu* exerted definite influence on Tansillo (*Lacrime di S. Pietro*, VIII) and on Marino's *Strage degli Innocenti*. Tasso owed to it "tutta la mossa iniziale della Gerusalemme," and much of the reputed Virgilian influence there really proceeds from Sannazaro. Indisputable is the imitation of him in the *Christiadi* of Vida. This poem is really Christian, and superior therefore to the *De partu* in all that regards plan. Further, Vida is interested in the narrative, Sannazzaro in the dogma of Christianity. But Vida lacks the elegance and the lyric movement of Sannazaro (pp. 50-57).—The *Saggio di bibliografia* (pp. 51-61) cites fifty-one editions of the *De Partu* between 1526 and 1844.

The hymns to S. Iacobo and S. Gaudioso have nothing noteworthy. But Mr. M. cites some curious cases where Testament passages (e. g., the arrival of the bride-groom) are utilized but in forms that exist almost textually in Catullus and Horace—a fine evidence of the pagan temper of Renaissance Christianity. To S. Nazaro the poet had a peculiar relation: his family came from the village of S. Nazaro; and he was born on that saint's day. Sannazaro, therefore, inspired by what Mr. M. considers a degenerate anthropomorphism in the religion of his time, offered to S. Nazaro a cult that was especially serious; and in moments of unusual stress of circumstances—as for instance during his exile in France—the poet directed to him sapphics "delle più meravigliose di tutta la letteratura latina del Rinascimento." The *Tristia* however are still not religious; if sacred at all, they are sacred for their love of Italy. The *Lamentatio de morte Christi domini* was written under just such conditions and approaches nearest of all the religious poems to ascetic Catholic ideals; it is therefore somewhat in contradiction with the rest of Sannazaro's Latin poems, and shows the variation of feelings the minds of the period were capable of. The lowest ebb of his art also is found in his Italian religious verses; where not even the brilliancy of the humanist comes to the rescue of a cold and ineffectual inspiration.

A. A. L.

* Sannazaro cleverly assimilates Virgil to his Christian theme by putting the Fourth Eglogue almost textually into the prophecy of Jordan.

Verzeichnis der Namen der altfranzösischen Chanson de Geste: Aliscans. By Paul Rasch. Magdeburg, Carl Friese, 1909. 8vo, pp. 44.

The present work was announced in the prefatory note of the edition of *Aliscans* published by him in 1903 in conjunction with E. Wienbeck and W. Hartnacke. The compiler has included in his list the proper names in the edition of the *Willame* published by Professor Baist, also those in the *Willehalm*, according to the edition of Lachmann and the study of San Marte. An uninformed person would probably infer from the words used concerning the "edition" of Professor Baist that this edition was the first to announce the discovery of the MS. of the *Willame*. The author might at least have spelled correctly the title (however unfortunate) adopted by Professor Baist.

A work which offered a careful list of the proper names in the three related poems mentioned would be of genuine value. The pleasant anticipations with which we take up Mr. Rasch's book are sure to be disappointed. The task has not been done with sufficient thoroughness, with sufficient reflection. Yet, surely, the compiler had no lack of good models, in the works of H. Hawickhorst, and E. Langlois.¹

One aggravating blunder in the plan of the book soon strikes the reader: in many instances, not all the occurrences of a name are given. When the reader discovers this, a very large part of the supposed value of the work has disappeared. A defect of less importance is the author's gift in selecting an undesirable form of a proper name and making it the norm. For example, why *Ainquin*, and not *Aquin*? Why *Tiebaut*, instead of *Tibaut*? Why *Porpillart*? Why *Gerart* instead of *Girart*, *Geronde* instead of *Gironde*? Why *Baldavin* with *v* and *Corboran* with the second *o*? Why the double *l* in *Tollete*, and why *Rainceval*? Why *Vrabel*, when the form is *Urabel*? This last name recalls the lamentable fashion in which the compiler misuses and, apparently, misapprehends *u* and *v*. He seems to be under the impression that the scribes distinguish frequently between these letters. We find, for example, under *Buevon* a number of forms with *v*, but by their side others with *u*, such as *Bouon*. And what shall we say of such forms as (under *Folatille*) *Uolatille*, *Uolatin*, by the side of *Volatile*, *Folatin*? Is *Ualfondee* anything different from *Valfondee*, *Uermandais*, from *Vermandois*, *Uiuen*, from *Vivien*?

I venture to set down at random a number of suggestions, some of which might prove desirable for a second edition of Mr. Rasch's work.

On page 1, it seems to the writer worth while to mention as significant that Aelis calls *Renoart frere*, and the compiler makes a similar error in stating that Bertran is given as the uncle of Vivien because he calls him *nies*. It is astounding that such blunders exist.—The correction of *Alfais*, as found in the edition of Baist, into *Alfais* was properly made.—*Amoravins*, l. 2441 of the *Willame* should have been included, in view of *Pincenars* and numerous similar names. Under *Ansune*, l. 2559 of the *Willame* should by all means have been mentioned.—The statement that *Archanc*, in l. 47 of MS. *e* is feminine, is incorrect, which renders grotesque the exclamation-point of the writer.—The visible error: *de Dasturges* (under *Dasturges* and *Turlen*) should have been corrected to *d'Asturges*.—*Beleem* occurs in the *Willame*, and should not have been omitted.—I think that it would have been preferable to print *Bernard* and

¹ H. Hawickhorst, *Romanische Forschungen*, XIII, 1902, p. 689 ss.; E. Langlois, *Table des Noms Propres dans les Chansons de Geste*, Paris, 1904.

Tedbald (with *d*, rather than *t*).—*Aspre* and *Cordres* are the better forms of the names given under *Ap̄e* and *Cordes*. The statement made that Bride is in Galicia is unwarranted, and betrays an ignorance that would grieve Mr. Joseph Bédier.²—According to the list, Garin appears only in the *Willame*. Why then does the author speak of him as Vivien's father? This relationship nowhere appears in that chanson. Another point: the name Garin is to be found in the variants to *Aliscans* as given by Mr. G. Rolin in his edition, after l. 4635 and in l. 7736.—The definition of *Canaloine* as Canaan has no warrant known to me.—*Chastele* has been omitted. I am not familiar with *Grachardin* at the beginning of MS. *e* of *Aliscans*, but have seen there *Guichardin*.—The statement that Glorianne is a region near Arles is wide of the mark.—The name *Efforaon* should appear (*Aliscans*, MS. *e*, l. 30^a).—Under *Timonier* (which the compiler does well to give), he should, as a concession to certain MSS., have included the name of Landri.—Having included *Timonier*, one is at a loss why he did not include also *Palasin*.—*Malo* would have been preferable to *Mallou*.—The statement made under *Hunaut* that MS. *d* has *Huez* in l. 7 of *Aliscans*, is incorrect.—Under *Haucbier*, the epithet *d'Erpin* should be added for l. 290 of MS. *d*, and *Erpin* should appear as a proper name.—Under *Vuisant*, MS. *d* has *Vicant*, not *Vincent*.—Hubert, who is named in l. 5902 of MS. *V* of *Aliscans*, should appear in the list.—It is surprising not to find the very important reading *Ermentrut* of MS. *M*, following l. 3875 of *Aliscans*.—It would probably be well to treat *Rufin*, in l. 1416 of *Aliscans*, as a proper name. The scribe of MS. *V* certainly understood it thus, for he writes: *Ruphin*. The city of Rains is mentioned in l. 2691 of this poem, MS. *V*, but, as in many other similar cases, the name is lacking in the present volume.—The author has done well in changing the *d'Urces* (?) of l. 1399 of *Aliscans*, edition of Halle (vid. variant of *C*), into *Durces*.—Doubtless the first *n* of *Sarragoncans* should be omitted.—The form given by MS. *C*, in l. 1854, is *Matusalans*, and not as printed.—Under *Tiebaut*, the reference to l. 335^a should be to 355^a. It would have been desirable to give the name *Rabie*, *Arabie*, in view of the variants of MS. *M*, which offer, in l. 1776 of *Aliscans*, *Tiber de Rabie*, and, in l. 2773, *Tibaus de Rabie*. There should have been a form *Naymer* given, in view of certain important variants. The writer distinguishes two heroes bearing the name *Bandus*; he might have shown the possibility, if not the extreme likelihood, that these heroes are one and the same person, and that an attempted distinction has been introduced by the remanieur.—Instead of *Lealme*, in the *Willame*, one should probably read unhesitatingly: *Alealme*. The words: *Gumebald, frere Alealme*, of l. 3422, were wrongly interpreted: *G., frere a Lealme*.—Orguaquain is mentioned under *Vauquant*, but should be in the alphabetic list, with a cross-reference. Many names are in this situation. Concerning *Vauquant*, which the author gives as a proper name, I suggest its being an ordinary participle; vid. *vauquer* in *Godefroi*.—Certaine Terre should certainly have been included in the list of proper names, however uncertain we may be of its significance.—The articles *Guibelin* and *Guibert* should have been united, for they refer to one and the same person, as is indicated in several published texts, and also in various unpublished MSS. *Fou-*

² A similar mistake was made by Mr. Willy Schultz in his *Handschriftenverhältnis des Covenant Vivian*, p. 70, concerning the Larcant and Saint-Gilles.

con de Candie mentions Guibert d'Andrenas by the name Guibelin; we read there of a precious sword:

Desous Nerbone li ceinst a i. matin,
Ce jor qu'il pristrent le petit Guibelin.

(MS. de Londres, fol. 271 v°)

Similarly, in *Guibert d'Andrenas*, when Aymeri asks his wife to whom they shall leave their fief of Narbonne, she replies:

Sire, dist ele, Guibelin le hardi
La doit avoir, par foi le vos plevi.
... (MS. de Londres, fol. 176 r°)

It is not at all necessary to suppose that the Huges mentiond in ll. 3216 is a son of Bertran, as reflection will show.—The name Jaceram occurs in the *Willame*, and shoud appear in the author's list.—*Limenes* is printed with the last vowel as *é*; we are totally in the dark as to the quality of this vowel.—It is not clear why Mr. Rasch speaks of Aimeri in the *Willame* (l. 298) as falsly presented as the grandfather of Vivien.—The *v* in the name *Macabev* shoud be a *u*.—The Tedbald l'esturman of the *Willame* is the Tibaut, first husband of Orable, and shoud be treated with Tibaut. Again, the article concerning Tedbald de Burges shoud probably include (at least with a question mark) the Tibaut d'Arrabe (error probably for: *de Berri*) of l. 2773 of *Aliscans*.—Flori is put down as an enemy of Guillaume in the *Willame*. Professor George L. Hamilton has suggested in a letter to me that Flori may be the name of a horse.—The name Romaigne is definad as Rumania in l. 582* of *Aliscans*: *Mais par saint Pere k'en requiert en Romaigne*. This definition woud offer an occasion for returning to the writer at least one of the exclamataion points of which he is so prodigal.

R. W.

Trouvaille ou Pastiche? Doutes exprimés au sujet de la Chanson de Willame.

Par Emile Tron, Bari, Joseph Laterza et Fils, 1909.

Professor Tron, of the Royal Technical Institute of Rome, believes that the *Chanson de Willame* may well be a forgery. A number of points appear to him suspicious: the fact that the owner and discoverer of the poem conceals his name, and refuses to let the MS. be seen;¹ that the MS. contains linguistic errors which are ascribd (by the scholars) to the scribe's being an "Anglo-Norman," who knew French imperfectly; that Gaston Paris had put forth the hypothesis that a chanson older than *Aliscans* and the *Chevalerie Vivien* had preceded these poems; also that Paris had conjecturd that the original form of the epithet of Guillaume was: *au courb nez*, which is actually found a number of times in the *Willame*; that the *Willame* alone of all the

* One might at first suppose that there has been an identical contamination in the case of Hugon de Berri in *Orson de Beauvais*, who is calld Hugon l'Arabi in l. 2361. An examination shows, however, that the latter title was given him intentionally by the author, and that it signifies 'felon, criminal.'

¹ One of my friends, who is a skild paleografist, has seen the MS. of the *Willame*; I believe, too, that a second friend has seen it.

chansons of the geste exists in a single MS., not in a cyclic collection; the fact, asserted by Mr. Joseph Bédier, that the author of the newly found poem knew nearly all the chansons of the cycle, yet his poem announces itself as being as ancient probably as the *Chanson de Roland*, etc. The author ridicules the filological evidence brought out by me in the *Romania*:* for him, evidently, all such attempts at determining the origin and relativ dates of MSS. and texts are vain.

It is perhaps well, once for all, to have exprest some of the doubts which must have flasht over the minds of Romance scholars when the discovery of the *Willame* was announst. All at first must have felt some doubt, but it coud not stand before the indubitable evidence of the text as publisht. Furthermore, it woud have been better to express these doubts in a form showing more acquaintance with and appreciation of modern critical scholarship. In fact, there is not one of the arguments adust in the present volume which has any value. In conclusion, let me draw attention to the author's unconscious self-deception: he early in his study puts forth the supposition that the *Willame* may be a forgery, and that its perpetrator may be at present laughing in secret over the success of his mystification; all of this is very well. But he immediately begins to assume that the poem *is* a forgery, and that its perpetrator *does* exist.

R. W.

*Vol. XXXIV, p. 243.

BRIEF REPORT ON AMERICAN CONTRIBUTIONS TO ROMANCE SCHOLARSHIP IN 1910.

GENERAL

Quindecim signa ante iudicium. A Contribution to the History of the Latin Versions of the Legend, by H. E. Sandison, *Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen*, 1910, pp. 73-83. Studies the question in Aquinas, Damien, etc. Review of D. Jones' *Intonation Curves*, by R. Weeks, *Maitre Phonétique*, 1910, pp. 82-3.—*Origin of the Medieval Passion-Play*, by K. Young, *Mod. Lang. Pub.*, 309-354. Proposes that the passion-play could have developed independently of the *Planctus* from the *passio* itself. Discussion of the *Litterae* of passion MSS. and the dramatic character of the *depositio crucis*.—*An Early Italian Edition of Aesop's Fables*, by H. E. Smith, *Mod. Lang. Notes*, pp. 65-7. A relative of those collections which derive ultimately from that of Gualterus Anglicus (anno 1175).—*Antigone's Song of Love*, by G. L. Kittredge, *Mod. Lang. Notes*. It was inspired by Guillaume de Machaut's *Paradis d'Amour*, not by the *Filostrato*.—*On Feedles in the Knight's Tale*, *ibid.*, p. 28. Examples showing use of *pois*, etc., in similar figures, from *Perceval le Gallois*, *Troie*, *Boiardo*. Cf. also Miss Gildersleeve, *ibid.*, p. 30.—*The Bleeding Lance*, by A. C. L. Brown, *Mod. Lang. Pub.*, 1-59. A notable article proving the Celtic and non-Christian origin of the lance.—*A World Census of Incunabula*, by G. C. Keidel, *Mod. Lang. Notes*, 161-5. Geographical distribution of incunabula.—*Professor Kastner's Hypothesis*, by J. M. Berdan, *ibid.*, pp. 1-4. On the mutual relation of the three forms of a sonnet appearing in St. Gelais, Wyatt and Sannazaro.—*L'Art pour l'art*, by J. E. Spingarn, *ibid.*, p. 95. Example in Constant's correspondence earlier than the occurrence in the lectures of Cousin, 1818, hitherto cited as the origin.—*The Sources of Stevenson's Bottle Imp*, by J. W. Beach, *ibid.*, pp. 12-18. In connection with the mandrake, we might expect a reference to Machiavelli's comedy of that name, which explains Roscoe's translation of the German title.—*Allgemeine Phonetik*, by R. Weeks, *Romanische Jahresbericht der romanischen Philologie*, X, I, 47-53.

FRENCH

The Boulogne Manuscript of the Chevalerie Vivien, by R. Weeks, *Mod. Lang. Review*, V (1910), pp. 54-68.—*An Old French Metrical Paraphrase of Psalm XLIV published from all the known Manuscripts and attributed to Adam de Persigne*, by T. A. Jenkins, *Gesellschaft für Romanische Literatur*, XX, pp. LV, 128.—*A New Fragment of the Old French Gui de Warewic*, by T. A. Jenkins, *Mod. Philology*, VII (1910), pp. 593-6. Found in the Library of York Minster.—*Chauceriana*, by G. L. Kittredge, *ibid.*, pp. 465-83. Indebtedness of Chaucer to Guillaume de Machaut, Geoffroy de Vinsauf, etc.—*The Mediaeval Mimus*, by P. S. Allen, *ibid.*, pp. 329-44. Doubts any connection between the Roman mime and the mediaeval *jongleur* and *spielmann*.—*Duke Frederick of Normandy, an Arthurian Romance*, by E. Thorstenberg, *ibid.*, pp. 395-409.

Analysis of contents.—*Melite*, by T. A. Jenkins, *Romania*, XXXIX (1910), pp. 83-6. Identifies it with the Island of Malta.—*Anc. Franc. moisseron*, by D. S. Blondheim, *ibid.*, p. 87. Identical with modern French *Mousseron*, English *mushroom*.—*The Weavers' Inscription in the Cathedral of Chartres*, by W. P. Shepard, *M.L.N.*, pp. 170-1. Successful solution of a difficulty caused by peculiar methods of glass workers.—*On an Acrostic in Villon*, by J. W. Kuhne, *M.L.N.*, p. 160. *Martheos* contains a reference to an unidentified *Marthe*.—*Guillaume de Deguileville and the Roman de la Rose*, by S. M. Galpin, *ibid.*, 159-160. Figure of a virtue compared to a candle.—*Chantecler*, by M. S. Garner, *ibid.*, p. 159. Use of animals in *La Forêt mouilléé* of Hugo.—*Une nouvelle Source d'Atala*, by G. Chinard, *ibid.*, 137-141. Studies *Les Aventures du Sieur Le Beau*. First of some noteworthy studies on Chateaubriand.—*The magic Balm of Gerbert and Fierabras*, by R. H. Griffith, *ibid.*, p. 102-4. Connects the balm that raises the dead with the Grail legend.—*Sainte-Beuve's Influence on Matthew Arnold*, by J. Warshaw, *ibid.*, 77-8. Nothing definite.—*Shakespeare's Julius Caesar*, by H. M. Ayres, *Mod. Lang. Pub.*, XXV, 183-227. Considers its relation to Jacques Grévin's *César* (1558).—*Landericus and Wach-erius*, by M. C. Spalding, *ibid.*, pp. 152-163. Corrects the reading of *Narciso* in a passage of Petrus Cantor to *Wacherio*, and modifies M. Lot's deductions from this passage in *Romania*, XXXII, 1 ff.—*On the Sources of Guillaume de Deguileville's Pèlerinage de l'Ame*, by S. L. Galpin, *ibid.*, pp. 275-308. Careful study on Gregory the Great, Jean de Meung, Boniface, and vision literature in general.—*An Eighteenth-Century Attempt at a Critical View of the Novel: the Bibliothèque Universelle des Romans*, by J. M. Clapp, *ibid.*, pp. 60-96. The author's analysis of this critical view is insufficient, as it is based on mechanical rather than esthetic data. As the empirical method in criticism is already found in France in the sixteenth century, the author need not be surprised at the bibliographical interest shown in the eighteenth century.—*En Aller à la Moutarde*, by C. D. Frank, *ibid.*, pp. 97-113. Locution arose from the custom of children singing satirical songs as they went to get mustard. The author neglects to note that *en* is not an integral part of the locution as *aller à la moutarde* appears without even *de*. A discussion of the meaning of this *de*, on this theory of the locution, would have been instructive. The distinctions in meaning by which a sort of Darwinian evolution for the locution is worked out are quite imaginary; and the "example of this locution" taken from the *Bourgeois de Paris* has nothing to do with the phrase. It might be adduced to prove that children sang on the way to the wine shop. The long note on p. 112 is pointless and mostly inaccurate. Additional illustrations of mustard figuring in street calls may be found in the Italian *cacce* of the fourteenth century published by Carducci.—*Moliere, his Life and his Works*, by Brander Matthews, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons.—*Jean Pelisson de Condrieu*, by J. L. Gerig, *Revue de la Renaissance*, 1910, pp. 113-125.

ITALIAN

Some Unpublished Translations from Ariosto by John Gay, by J. D. Bruce, *Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen*, 1909, pp. 279-98.—*A Source of Euphues. The Anatomy of Wit*, by S. L. Wolff, *Mod. Philology*, VII (1910), pp. 577-85. Indebtedness of Llyly to Boccaccio.—*The Belluno Fragment*, by E. H. Wilkins, *Mod. Lang. Notes*, pp. 45-47. A brief but important study: *avi bona part* means "triumphes"; the lines were a gloss to the chronicle, not

part of the original text; shatters the argument that the fragment is prose.—*The Origin of the Sestina*, by F. J. A. Davidson, *ibid.*, 18-20. The repetition of one rhyme in the following strophe suggested the repetition of all the rhymes in successive strophes.—*Vita Nuova and Dolce Stil Nuovo*, by A. G. H. Spiers, *ibid.*, pp. 37-9. In reply to Davidson, *ibid.*, Nov., 1909; *nuovo* has no connotation of *mystic* in the phrase *dolce stil nuovo*.—*Was Petrarch an Opium Eater*, by J. F. Bingham, *ibid.*, 82-6. The venerable author of this article, who has elsewhere given evidence of a real interest in Italian literature, proposes his query, curiously enough, on purely esthetic grounds, and assumes the scientific veracity of De Quincey's confessions.—*The Old Yellow Book: Source of Browning's The Ring and the Book*, review by A. S. Cook, *ibid.*, pp. 20-22. Objects to Hodell's translation of the Ital. *chirografo*. It is not clear that the translator misunderstood the word or that the term needs any comment. Naturally the only person who can sign a chirograph is, by the meaning of the term, the person who issues it.—*An Important Contemporary Cultivator of the Venetian dialect, Orlando Orlandini*, by A. A. Livingston, *ibid.*, pp. 145-9.

SPANISH

The Comédia Radiana of Augustin Ortiz, by R. E. House, *Mod. Philology*, VII (1910), pp. 507-56. Univ. of Chicago dissertation. Introduction, text, and notes.—*Short Stories and Anecdotes in Spanish Plays*, by M. A. Buchanan, *Mod. Lang. Review*, V (1910), pp. 78-90.—*Studies in New Mexican Spanish*, by A. M. Espinosa, reviewed in *Literaturblatt*, XXXI, cols. 206-8.—*The Amadis Question*, by G. S. Williams, *Revue Hispanique*, XXI, pp. 1-167. Columbia dissertation. The whole question is reworked and brought up to date with much additional material. *The History of the Question*. Discusses the language of the primitive *Amadis*, and concludes that present evidence does not warrant a judgment in favor of either French, Spanish, or Portuguese. II. *Time and Place*. Identifies geographical names appearing in the text with names in the *Round Table Romances* and in actual geography. III. *Episodes*. Compares the content of the *Amadis* with that of earlier romances. Practically complete sources for the first three books, while the fourth is shown to be built largely upon the preceding ones. Parts of the first three books probably composed by Montalvo in preparation for his fourth book and the *Serges de Esplandián*. Appendix and bibliography of editions.—*La Selva Confusa de Don Pedro Calderón de la Barca*, by G. T. Northup, *ibid.*, pp. 168-338. Critical edition of an autograph manuscript in the Osuna collection at the *Biblioteca Nacional*. Though the play is not one of Calderón's best, it is nevertheless very interesting, because the manuscript contains many passages that the author indicated were to be suppressed. Their reproduction in this edition allows us to see the method of procedure of the poet.—*Un Hijo Que Negó Á Su Padre*, by J. P. W. Crawford, *Mod. Lang. Pub.*, 268-74. Another entremés.—*Notes to the Don Quijote*, by G. T. Northup, *Mod. Lang. Notes*, pp. 184-9. The confusion in Spanish literature of the Palladion with the Trojan horse; Smith's argument for the date of I, 3, 1 is unsatisfactory; explanation of the pun in *hacaneas* and *cananeas*; the significance of the names Aldonza and Sancho; *vaca* and *carbero*; the lion anecdote (II, 17) has points of analogy with Bandallo, Nov. 49.—*A Note on Calderon's La Vida es Sueño*, by R. Schevill, *ibid.*, pp. 109-10. On the antiquity and nature of the title phrase.—*Ernesto García Ladevèze*, by J. P. W. Crawford, *ibid.*, p. 32. Biographical note.

NOTES AND NEWS

Both of the editors-in-chief of this Review are advocates of the movement for the simplification of English spelling. Within appropriate limits, contributors may feel free to follow their individual predilections in the matter.

We are often askt for the adress at Paris of a skilful paleograffist whose terms for copying and collation are entirely reasonable. We take pleasure in commanding without reserve M. Louis Engerand, archiviste-paléografe at the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris. If any of our readers can give similar addresses at London, Florence, Venice, Madrid, etc., they are requested to communicate the information to some one of the editors of this *Review*.

The annual *Livret de l'Etudiant* of the University of Paris is now in circulation, and may be ordered at the Bureau des Renseignements à la Sorbonne. Needless to state, this catalog is of great interest.

Professor K. Pietsch, of the University of Chicago, has been made Professor of Romance Filology. Mr. E. B. Babcock, of the same university, has been promoted to an assistant professorship in Romance languages.

John P. Rice, A.B., Ph.D., of Yale University, has been appointed Instructor in Romance languages at Williams College.

Mr. S. G. Morley, Ph.D., of Harvard University, 1902, has been chosen Acting-Professor of Romance languages at Colorado College, during the absence of Professor Hills.

Mr. F. A. Waterhouse, A.B., of Harvard, 1905, A.M., 1906, until this year graduat student at Harvard, has been made Instructor in Romance languages at Dartmouth College. Mr. C. Goggio, also a graduat student at Harvard, has gone to Dartmouth to occupy a similar position. Another Harvard graduat student in Romance, Mr. S. M. Waxman, has been named Instructor at Boston University. Mr. Waxman was Instructor in Romance languages at Syracuse University in 1907-08.

The production in English of Goldoni's *Il Ventaglio* is announst for December and January, by the Yale Dramatic Association. A translation of the play, which is publisht by the Association, has been specially made for this production by Professor Kenneth McKenzie.

Dr. George D. Davidson, formerly Instructor in Romance languages at the University of Michigan, has accepted a similar position at Vanderbilt University.

Mr. James Young, of Williams College, has been elected to an instructorship in Romance languages at Miami University.

Mr. Russell P. Jameson, of Oberlin, has been made Associate Professor of Romance languages. Since 1908, he has been completing his studies for the doctorat at the University of Paris.

Mr. Donald M. Gilbert, Wesleyan University, 1908, has been appointed Instructor in Romance languages at Northwestern.

Mr. John Hill, last year Fellow in Romance languages at Vanderbilt, has accepted a position in the department at the University of Wisconsin.

Mr. Gaetano Cavicchia, who has recently returnd from a year's study in France, has been made Instructor in Italian and French at the University of Missouri.

Professor E. K. Rand and Dr. E. H. Wilkins, of Harvard, have finisht the preparation of the Concordance to the Latin Works of Dante, the third and concluding volume in the series of Dante Concordances issued by the American Dante Society. The book is being printed by the Oxford Press. Professor Rand will pass the year 1912-13 as professor at the American School of Classical Studies at Rome.

Mr. John R. Fisher, formerly Instructor in Romance languages at Vanderbilt, and for the last year a student at Paris, has succeeded Professor D. B. Easter as Professor of Modern Languages at Randolph-Macon College, Virginia.

Mr. J. L. Borgerhoff, of Western Reserve University, has been made Professor of Romance languages at that institution.

The Corporation of Harvard University has received \$20,000 from the Duke and Duchess de Arcos in memory of Woodbury Lowery. The fund is to be held in perpetuity, the income to be awarded from year to year to some person, preferably an instructor or graduat of Harvard, to enable him to carry on research in historical archives, preferably those relating to American history in the archives of forein countries and more particularly in Spain.

Inquiry has reaht the editors of this *Review* as to the critical edition of the *Philomena de Chrétien de Troies*. Here is the title and description of the work: *Philomena, Conte raconté d'après Ovide, par Chrétien de Troies, par C. de Boer*, Paris, P. Geuthner, 1909. Price unbound, 10 francs.

According to the statistics for 1909, there were that year, in New England schools, 21,000 pupils studying French; 18,000 studying Latin; 10,000 studying German; 1,000 studying Greek.

Students of Old French literature will be interested in Professor Gustav Brockstedt's *Vom mittelhochdeutschen Volksepen franzosischen Ursprungs*, of which the first part has just appeard at Kiel. In this work, Prof. B. shows that the well-known Middle High German *Eckenlied*, *Virginal*, *Gudrun*, etc., are of French origin. In a preceding work entitld *Das altfranzösische Siegfriedlied* (1908), Prof. B. pointed out the French origin of the *Siegfriedlied*, the *Nibelungenlied*, etc. These works will be reviewd later.

All who feel an interest in modern language instruction in America will read with profit a recent pamphlet by Professor Paul Shorey, of Chicago University. Professor Shorey believes that the ancient and the modern languages are "in the same boat" in this country, and that they are menaced by the same dangers.

Dodd, Mead & Co. have just publisht a *Dictionary of Hard Words*, pp. 646, price \$1.20 net. The compiler is Robert Morris Pierce, whose lexicografical work is well known. The preface contains valuable fonetic comment. The alfabet employd is practically that of the International Fonetic Association. No such scientific indication of English pronunciation has hitherto appeard in any American dictionary.

Dr. R. E. House, of the University of Chicago, desires to call to the attention of those who are working in the early Spanish drama that he is preparing an edition of the *Comedia Vidriana* of Jayme de Guete.

The new edition of the *Chanson de Guillaume* by Professor H. Suchier has been publisht by Niemeyer, Halle; price, 5 marks.

OBITUARY

By the death at Baltimore on the ninth of November, 1910, of A. Marshall Elliott, professor of the Romance languages in the Johns Hopkins University, there has been stricken from the roll of active service the most conspicuous name in the contemporary annals of Modern Language instruction in America. Associated by family ties with the circle of Friends in the city of Baltimore, Mr. Elliott, from the earliest announcement of the Johns Hopkins endowment, was prominently mentioned in connection with a professorship in the new institution,—tho it is known that his own predilection was at that time toward the prosecution of Oriental rather than Romance investigation. At the opening of the University in 1876, Elliott was only thirty-two years of age, but his reputation was already re-enforced by academic degrees from Haverford and Harvard Colleges and by prolonged travel and study in Europe and the Orient.

It is no derogation from the fair fame of American scholarship to point out that, in the seventies, the teaching of the Modern languages in American institutions—as indeed in most institutions elsewhere—stood in strenuous need of overhauling and reorganization. Above all, it cried out to be set firmly on the true and only foundation of adequately trained, independent-minded and “first-hand” scholarship. For the younger generation of teachers it is difficult to conceive of a state of affairs in which there were no recurrent meetings of the Modern Language Association for friendly intercourse and mutual inspiration, no channels of special or periodical publication of any kind whatever. To cope with so discouraging a situation was a task peculiarly congenial to the energetic organizing power, the physical vigor and the indomitable exuberance of spirit so characteristic of Elliott's career thruout the period of his early youth and maturer manhood. To his prompt and hopeful initiative was not only due the launching of the Modern Language Association, which was successfully effected at Columbia University in the Christmas recess of 1883, but—what was crucial and far more significant—the continued existence of the large adventure was almost solely conditioned on his unflagging industry and infinitely patient attention to detail during the long years of his secretaryship and editorial supervision. Much the same encomium may be made of his establishment and early management of the monthly journal, *Modern Language Notes*, which constituted from the outset and still continues an important concomitant to the Association's work and mission; while from his efficient conduct of the department of Romance languages at the Johns Hopkins University there has gone forth a goodly fellowship of doctors of philosophy who are ever ready to bear testimony, by word and deed, to the master's experienced and unfailing guidance, his genial and warm-hearted kindness, his unstinted service and devotion. May the gratitude of his many students and of the unnumbered teachers and scholars who have been less directly reached by his work and influence, lend a benediction to his memory and honor to his name.

H. A. T.



C51

0E2E P
1328
2E32
3299
4538
5665
6788

0E2E P
1328
2E32
3299
4538
5665
6788